

Of a total of 16 22) People's Commissars, whose decisions de facto depended on the central party organs, 12 were Russians (75 v. EL), only a whole two Jews (12.5 v. H) and 2 other non-Russians (12.5 v. EL). But the one Jew, Trotsky, held the most important office at the time, next to the Commissariat of War, the leadership of Foreign Affairs. Russia, which at the time was still in a state of war with the Central Powers, had promised Lenin the immediate conclusion of peace with the slogan: "Power to the councils, land to the peasants, peace to the peoples and bread to the hungry!" and conquered power with this slogan. The end of the war and the resumption of diplomatic relations, with the help of which the propaganda of the world revolution could be carried on, were therefore the next and most important tasks.

Moreover, of these 16 People's Commissars, Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky were at the same time members of the Politburo during Lenin's era.

It was therefore only a natural consequence that the leaders of the Soviet delegation that crossed the front on December 2, 1917 and began the peace negotiations were all members of the CC. and belonged to Lenin's immediate environment. The composition of the delegation was as follows:23)

Chair: Joffe (Jew), candidate of the CC.;

Members: Kamenev (Jew), member of the Central Committee;

Sokolnikov (Jew), member of the CC...;

Bitzenko (Russian?); Maslotzki-Mstislavski (?); Olitsch (sailor),24) Belyakov (soldier), n

Stashkov (peasant), Russians;

Obukhov (worker), Karakhan (Armenian, secretary).

The chairman and the two leading members of the first F r i e d e n s d e l e g a t i o n were all three Jews.

In contrast, the representatives of the people – the peasants, workers, soldiers and sailors – were all Russians, of course. But they were only the staffage, and at the peace negotiations, which resumed after a fourteen-day break on December 22, they were already no longer part of the delegation. After the negotiations had been broken off again because of the unacceptable Bolshevik demands, they were resumed for the third time on January 9, 1918. The composition of the delegation had changed again and now, under the chairmanship of Trotsky, the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, was as follows:2Ö)

Chairman: Trotsky (Jew);

Members: Joffe (Jew);

Kamenev (Jew);

Pokrovsky (Russian);

Bitzenko (Russian?);

Karelin (?);

Karachan (Armenian).

Military consultants:

Altwater (Jew);

Lipski (?);

Samoilo (?).

Consultants for national issues:

Radek (Jew);

Stutschka (Latvian);

Bobinski (Pole);

Mitkevich-Kapsukas (Lithuanian).

But even these negotiations did not bring peace. Only when, against all expectations, the German troops

resumed their advance after the expiration of the ultimatum, an agreement was reached. On March 3, 1918, the peace treaty between the Central Powers and Soviet Russia was signed. The plenipotentiaries on the Russian side were:28)

Chairman: Sokolnikov (Jew);

Members: Petrovsky (Ukrainian);

Chicherin (Russian);

Karachan (Armenian).

Political consultant:

Joffe (Jew).

Thus, of the five delegates from Soviet Russia who had to decide on the outcome of the three years of immense bloodshed and sacrifice of the Russian people and to determine its relations with its former enemies, two were Jews (40%). And in each of the 4 differently composed delegations a Jew had the chair. One Jew was each time the political and one Jew was the national consultant.

Radek (Sobelsohn) Joffe

Gussyev Volodarsky (Goldstein)

Members of the Bolshevik peace delegation in Brest-Litovsk

Top: Trotyki, Joffe Bottom: Kamenev, Joffe

Let us now turn to the Politburo. In order to understand the position of power of the individual leading party and Soviet organs in the Lenin period, we have to catch up on the following:

After the October overthrow, the party apparatus of the Bolsheviks in the shape of the Central Committee and the governorate committees initially lost its previous leading position. Governmental power passed to the soviets, in whose name the overthrow had also been carried out. The supreme organ of the RSFSR, became 1st. Constitution the Congress of Councils and, in the period between its sessions, the "All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Councils of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies."

True to his idea of "centralism" in administration, however, Lenin dealt a crushing blow to the system of "democratic centralism" already at the 2nd Congress of Councils when constituting the government apparatus. He created a special supreme government body, the Sovnarkom, to which executive power was transferred and which thus became a competitor of the Central Executive Committee.

As mentioned above, however, it was not the Sovnarkom but the Central Committee of the Party that had to make de facto decisions.

Then, when from March 1918 on the opposition of the "Left Communists" appeared, who boycotted the Central Committee and finally left the government with the Left Social Revolutionaries, the center of Soviet power passed from the CC. to the troika (triumvirate):26a)

Lenin (Russian?);

Stalin (Georgian);

Sverdlov (Jew).

This troika opened the struggle against the supporters of "democratic centralism" and began to implement "centralism" both in the leadership of the party and in the government of the country. Thus began the long internal party struggle for "democracy."

In order for Lenin and his group to be able to govern completely unbound and independent of the CC. as well, at Lenin's instigation the Politburo, which had been set up before the overthrow, was subsequently incorporated into the constitution of the party apparatus.* 27) For although the members of the CC. were ideologically united, they were constantly vacillating on all questions raised by the opposition.

they were constantly wavering and divided among themselves. Lenin's decision to govern through a

small, compliant Politburo, rather than through the many-member CC, was particularly prompted by the uprising of many CC members in the first Bolshevik winter of 1917-18. Thus, at the 8th Party Congress (1919), Zinoviev was entrusted to introduce the project through the Politburo and the Orgburo (Organizational Bureau, for the conduct of all organizational work). Since some opposition leaders understood that this was an extreme restriction of the CC's right of co-determination over leadership in politics, they sharply opposed the project. Oppositionist Osinski aptly reflected the future absolute power position of the Politburo in the following words:²⁸⁾

"... It thus follows that the Political Bureau, consisting of 5 heads, will just decide the main questions, while the plenary session will assemble for general discussions for deliberation. A whole 14 members (of the Z.K.H.F.) thus become members of second rank s." But the delegates, feeling uneasy because of the impending danger from the White Movement, accepted the project, and the two bureaus were included in the statutes. Thus, the Politburo also legally became the supreme party and government organ.

To mark its paramount importance in all questions of Bolshevik! domestic and foreign policy, we list the most important provisions concerning the Politburo below:²⁹⁾

"The Politburo consists of 5 members of the CC. All other members of the CC. who may attend one or another meeting of the Political Bureau have only an advisory vote at these meetings.

The Political Bureau makes decisions that do not allow any postponement and gives an account of its work every two weeks to the regular plenary session of the Central Committee." (Blocking H. F.)

Practically, the most important provision was not respected, since the Politburo decided all questions and only brought them to the attention of the CC. This became even clearer when, after the 10th Party Congress (1921), the CC. met only once in two months instead of twice a month, and the All-Russian Party Conferences were held only twice a year instead of four times.³⁰⁾

Thus, already under Lenin, the supreme power of government was gradually transferred from the soviets to the highest organ of the party, a college of party leaders that was not yet full.

The following table shows the national composition of the Politburo during the years 1918-1922, until Lenin's final departure from politics.¹⁾

stepped down. The other place is occupied by the Jew Zinoviev: the Jewish share increased as much as the Russian share decreased. As a result, at the end of Lenin's period the Jews were again equally represented in the Politburo as the Russians. In the increase of the number of members of the Politburo the Jews have the same share as the Russians. There are only two persons who make up this increase, but they are at the top of the power: one of them is a Jew.

According to the first more accurate party census of 1922, the share of Jews in the party as a whole was 5.2 percent.³⁴⁾ Their share in the Politburo in that year thus exceeded their share in the party as a whole by 8.2 m a 1. Another confirmation of the extraordinarily strong penetration of Jews into the highest echelons.

The ratio becomes even starker when one compares the proportion of Jews in the Politburo with their proportion in the total population. Since the latter amounted to 1.77 per cent,³⁵⁾ the Jews in the Politburo, in the center of Soviet power, were on the average of the epoch about 21 m a 1 more strongly represented than corresponds to their population ratio. . . .

The Central Committee of the Party, which had the real party leadership, had, as noted, been relegated to the background in the Lenin epoch in favor of the all-powerful Politburo. Nevertheless, as the top organization of the Communist Party, it was of outstanding importance for the entire party and state policy. If only because the members of the Politburo were elected from among its members.

The national composition of

the Central Committee can be seen in the following table: ")

National composition of the Central Committee of the CP.

1918–1922

As in the Politburo, the proportion of Jews in the Central Committee is extraordinarily high and many times higher than in the Sownarkom. It varies between 22.2 and 34.8 percent; the average for the period is 25.7 percent. Jews make up a quarter of the entire membership of the Central Committee in this period. All other non-Russian nationalities together must be content with an average share of 18.6%. The Jewish share in the CC. exceeds their share in the entire party almost fivefold and the population ratio of Jews in the RSFSR, on average, more than fourteen times.

Comparing this table with the percentage of Jews in the CC. during the preparatory period, i.e., up to the October Revolution of 1917 (table on p. 36), we find the following:

The average percentage of Jews in the Central Committee in the first period after the revolution is slightly lower than before the overthrow: from 32.6% it decreased by 21.3% to 25.7%. This is due to the fact that as a result of the extraordinary growth of the party in the years 1918 to 1922 – about 4.5 times⁸⁷⁾ – the total number of members of the Central Committee was also greatly increased. Whereas after the 7th Party Congress in 1918 a 23-member Central Committee was elected, after the 11th Party Congress there were 46. But in contrast to the Politburo, the Jews in the Central Committee did not participate in this increase to the same extent: because the Politburo, and not the Central Committee, represented the supreme organ of power.³⁸⁾

Conversely, the proportion of Russians in the Central Committee is increasing: on average it is 53.8 percent (1903–1917: 47.4 percent); among the candidates alone, the proportion of Russians is still somewhat higher, 58 percent on average.

If we compare the average national composition of the Politburo and the CC in Lenin's era, the following picture emerges: In percentages were represented on average:

It can be seen that the Jews were the only ones more significantly represented in the Politburo than in the Central Committee. Why? The Politburo had the supreme power of government. Both the Russians and the non-Jewish foreigners had a smaller share in the Politburo than in the Central Committee.

If we still compare alone the proportion of Jews in the average of the preparatory period (1903–mid-1917) with the months immediately preceding and following the Bolshevik overthrow and the first subsequent soviet epoch, the following emerges. The Jewish share in the CC. and Politburo was in v. H.: The percentage of Jews in both the CC. and the Politburo is greatest just before and after the Bolshevik overthrow! In the ZK. 40 and 34.8 per cent, respectively, and in the Politburo 57.2 per cent. Both in the period preceding the overthrow and at a certain distance after the revolution it is lower: it is precisely in the most decisive period of the immediate preparation and implementation of the revolution and the establishment of Bolshevik rule that the Jews develop the greatest activity. During this period they have secured for themselves the broadest and firmest place in the highest positions of power.

In the following diagram 1 the movement of the Jewish share in the Central Committee and in the Politburo before, during and after the revolution is graphically plotted.

Clearly visible in the curve for the Central Committee are the two high peaks during the revolutionary years 1905–07 and 1917. From 1903 onward, the Jewish share rises steeply in line with the growth of the revolutionary movement. It goes directly to the revolution of 1905. The same picture in 1917 – at the same time as the overthrow approaches, the number of Jews under the coming rulers increases rapidly. At the most decisive moment their activity to secure their position of power is the greatest.

The curve for the Politburo is by far higher than the curve for the Central Committee: the Jews are most strongly represented in the highest echelons of power. An initial decrease is followed by a more significant increase: at the end of Lenin's epoch, the Jews have fully maintained their predominant share in the highest echelons of power.

Jewish rulers.

In the Lenin epoch, the following state power positions were wholly or mostly in Jewish hands.

The chairman of the Central Executive Committee of Councils, the highest and most representative authority of the state, the 1st. Constitution the Council of People's Commissars was responsible for – Sverdlov. He held this post continuously from November 1917 until his death. He was one of the three who formed the center of Soviet power from the beginning of 1918 until March 1919. Sverdlov also directed all organizational activities within the Central Executive Committee. He was also simultaneously the political secretary of the com-

Bela Kun (Aaron Kohen) Semlyachka (Salkind)

Lasdiewitsdi Lenin in conversation with Tibor Szamuely, one

one of the Jewish leaders of the Hungarian

Soviet republic

Communist party. He kept the lists of the most important party members and determined their distribution among the various posts in the party and state administration. His double position as secretary of the party and chairman of the Central Executive Committee granted him a decisive influence on the entire policy of the Bolsheviks.

He was one of the most outstanding and dangerous Jewish Bolshevik leaders. Sverdlov had been a member of all the special staffs preparing for the overthrow and had been among the 10 main leaders of the October Revolution. He is the main culprit in the murder of the Tsar's family. Their fate was decided by Sverdlov and Goloshchekin, the Jewish leading Chekist in Ekaterinburg, the prison of the Tsar family, in Moscow.⁴⁰) About Sverdlov the People's Commissar Steinberg said, "he was cold-blooded, calculating, steely". He had an enormous memory; Radek said of him, "Sverdlov carried in his head a party card file with all the dead and living active workers of the party." His memory and notebook represented the whole apparatus of the Party secretariat. His sudden death shortly before the 8th Party Congress – he is said to have been beaten to death in a Moscow factory – prompted the Central Committee to create a special Party Secretariat. –

When German troops advanced again in early 1918, and the Soviet government moved its headquarters from Petrograd to Moscow, the abandoned capital was placed under the command of the "Committee for the Revolutionary Defense of Petrograd." The committee consisted of:⁴¹)

Uritzki (Jew),

Volodarsky (Jew), Yeremeyev (Russian), Podvoiski (Russian), Goosev (Jew).

Out of 5 members of the committee, 2 were Russians and 3 were Jews. It was the Jew Uritzki who, at the head of a sailor detachment of 50 men, blew apart the Constituent Assembly at 4:40 a.m. on January 6, 1918.

On March 9, 1918, the administration of the Northern Commune established the "Petrograd War Revolutionary Commissariat" at the head of the capital's administration. Its membership was as follows:⁴²)

Trotsky (Jew), Chair, Uritzki (Jew), Blagonravov (Russian), Yeremeyev (Russian), Posern (Jew), Fomin (Krochmal, Russian?), Yermolayev (Russian).

Out of 7 members, 4 were Russians, 3 were Jews.

On March 12 the Petrograd Soviet appoints the People's Commissars of the Northern Commune:

People's Commissar for Internal Affairs becomes Uritzki (Jew), at the same time he leads foreign affairs and is head of the Petrograd Cheka. After signing the first mass death sentence, he was shot a few days later. Press Commissar becomes Volodarsky (Goldstein, Jew), also assassinated.

The Communist International had always been a stronghold of Jewry. In Lenin's era, the leadership of the Comintern was in the hands of three Jews: Zinoviev, Felix Kohn and Radek.⁴³) Zinoviev remained chairman of the ECCI until his fall in 1926. When decisions were made on questions of some

importance, Lenin and Trotsky always took part in the meetings. In 1929 in the leadership of the Comintern were the Jews: Bela Kun, Manuilski, Clara Zetkin, Warski, Pelawski- Bennet, Rafes, Martynow and Losowski, d. s. 4 2 v. H. of the leadership.

*

During the civil wars of 1918 to 1921, the center of gravity of Soviet power rested on military force and the Cheka.

At the head of the military power was the Jew Trotsky. He was People's Commissar of the Army and Fleet, chairman of the "Revolutionary War Council of the Republic" established in September 1918, and organizer of the Red Army. Member of the Central Committee of the Party and the Politburo. His right hand man in the "War Council" was Ephraim Skljanski; member of the Collegium of the People's Commissariat for Army and Fleet and representative of the Chairman of the Revolutionary War Council.

The first Revolutionary War Council itself consisted of the following members:

Trotsky (Jew), S. Kamenev (Russian),

Sklyanski (Jew), L. Kamenev (Jew),

Gusev (Jew), Aralov (Russian),

Muralov (Russian).

Later they were joined by Unschlicht (Jew), a member of the College of the Commissariat of War and the supreme head of the military reconnaissance service.

Thus, out of 8 members of the highest military authority, 3 were Russians (37.5 per cent), 5 were Jews (62.5 per cent).

Member of the Revolutionary War Councils on all fronts, commander of the Eastern Front and commander of troops in the Siberian Military District - Lasevich (Jew).

Commander of the Northern Front, member of the "Revolutionary War Council of the Front" - Posern (Jew).

Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, member of the Military Revolutionary Soviet of the VII Army and Chairman of the "Committee for the Defense of the Republic", member of the Central Committee and the Politburo - Zinoviev (Jew).

Chairman of the Moscow Soviet and temporary chairman in the "Council of Labor and Defense" (STO.), member of the Central Committee and Politburo - Kamenev (Jew).

Responsible party official on all fronts of the Civil War, member of the CC. - Sokolnikov (Jew).

Head of the artillery workshops and representative of the "Extraordinary Commission for the Supply of the Army" - Serebrowski (Jew).

Leading member of the "Collegium for the implementation of the state of war at the Council of Labor and Defense" - Messing (Jew).

Leading member of the College of the People's Commissariat for the Army and Fleet of the Northern Commune - Yurenev (Jew).

*

The "Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution, Speculation and Sabotage" (Cheka) was established on December 7, 1917.

It is claimed by the Jewish side that, unlike other Soviet organs, Jews had no command positions in the Cheka. The contrary view is, as Heller says, "an assertion that cannot be proved by anything." "

What about this in reality?

While Latvians, Poles and other non-Russians generally excelled in the Cheka, the leading role as leaders and organizers of the Cheka apparatus belongs to the Jews. The following Jews - some of them since the post-Lenin period - were or are in the leading position in the Cheka and OGPU:46)

Sachs⁴⁷) – the assistant of Dzerzhinski (Pole), the head of the first All-Russian Cheka.

The Presidium of the Petrograd Cheka, established in early 1918, consisted of:⁴⁸)

Uritzki (Jew), Chair, Bokij (Caucasian), Wortschlewski (?), Josilewitsch (Jew), i.e. the Presidium consisted of 50 per cent Jews.

Jagoda – the assistant of Menshinski (Pole), the head of the Cheka and OGPU. after Dzerzhinski's death.

Belongs to the Cheka since its inception, was the head of all domestic work and representative of the head of the special department of the Cheka; executive director and organizer of the Cheka apparatus.

Deputy Chairman of the OGPU.,⁴⁰) Married to the niece of Sverdlov. Today plays the leading role in the OGPU.

Brass – continuously in the leading position in the Cheka and OGPU.; Chairman of the Moscow Cheka, member of the Collegium of the All-Russian Cheka; Chairman of the Cheka in Leningrad; Deputy Chairman of the OGPU.⁵⁰)

Unschlicht – deputy to the Chairman of the All-Russian Cheka, supreme head of the military reconnaissance service.⁵¹)

Mogilevsky – the head of the Foreign Affairs Department.⁵²)

Artusov – the organizer of the department of internal reconnaissance.⁵³)

Katzenelson – the organizer of the border department.⁶⁴)

Trilisser – the organizer of the Foreign Affairs Department of the All-Russian Cheka and OGPU. in its present form; Mogilevski's successor; Deputy Chairman of the OGPU.⁵⁵)

Kogan – the assistant of Katzenelson.⁶⁶)

Breslau – chairman of the Moscow Cheka.⁶⁷)

There were also numerous Jews among the heads of the local Cheka:

Goloshchekin – senior Chekist, war commissar and member of the presidium of the Ural regional Soviet. Along with Sverdlov, the main culprit in the murder of the Tsar's family.⁵⁸) Yurovsky – senior Chekist in the Ekaterinburg Cheka^ Judicial Commissar of the Ural Region. Leader of the commando that executed Nikolai II and the Tsar's family.⁶⁹)

Safarov – senior Chekist and deputy chairman in the Ural Region Soviet.^{60a})

Böla Kun (Aaron Koben) – head of the Crimean Cheka, the "mass slaughterer of the Crimea".⁸⁰)

Semlyachka – his secretary and secretary of the Crimean Party Committee.⁸¹)

Kohn – senior member of the Kharkov Cheka, chairman of the Kharkov Governorate Enforcement Committee.⁸²)

Lander – Cheka plenipotentiary in the North Caucasus.⁸³)

Nachimsohn – senior Chekist and war commissar of the Yaroslavl military district.⁸⁴)

Weinberg – head of the Cheka's foreign department in Saratov.⁸⁵)

Schwartz – chairman of the Cheka in Ukraine.⁸⁶)

Finkelstein, Ehlenkrieg, Grünstein – senior members of the Kiev Cheka.⁸⁷)

Meisel-Kedrov – leading Chekist and notorious executioner in the Northern region.⁸⁸)

On the basis of these facts, a leading role of Jews in the central management and organization of the Cheka apparatus and their active participation in the management of local Cheka must be considered proven.

Reaction.

The dominant position of the Jews in Soviet power and the preferential treatment of the Jewish population had provoked a fierce defensive movement among the Russian people. The movement against the Jews was particularly strong in the former settlement area. There, in contrast to the largely peasant Russian population, the Jews had gone over to the side of the Bolsheviks right at the beginning of Soviet rule. While the masses still followed the Jewish leadership in the revolutionary year of 1917,

this relationship changed in one fell swoop, when the Jews, having come to power, confronted the population as the masters. Hitherto the peasant had known the Jew as the economically superior, but oppressed by the tsarist government. If he had remained strange and peculiar to him as a follower of another religion, the mood changed to open hostility when he became the master.

From the top to the village Soviet, the most powerful and visible representatives of the Bolshevik power were the Jews.

When then this new power, which turned against the peasants and against the peasant property, appeared in front of the village as the "communist" one, and the peasants rose up against the Soviet power, then they united both slogans: "Against the communists, against the Jews." (69)

If the Jews thus appeared as the most conspicuous and passionate defenders of Soviet power, it was only a natural consequence that wide circles of the population identified Soviet power with Jewish rule. As Maslov, (70) the well-known Russian connoisseur of peasant life and one of the most thoughtful observers of Russia at that time, reports, the expression "shidovskaya vlasty" (Jew rule) was used very frequently, especially in Ukraine and in the former settlement area. And this expression was not applied in a polemical sense, but as a quite objective statement of the existence and policy of the new rulers.

When the peasant in Ukraine called his transportation and labor duty a "shidovskaya panshchina" (Jewish compulsory labor), he did not curse, but expressed his sincere conviction that the new "panshchina" was actually introduced by the Jews.

Another example of this identification: if a Jew, who was even personally known to the people talking, joined a group that was casually discussing Soviet affairs, the conversation almost always broke off immediately and moved on to another topic.

"This conviction," writes Maslow, "of the general and active participation of the Jews in Soviet power also explains the action of the insurgent detachments, which exterminated Communists and Jews alike. The present pogroms, accompanied by mass slaughter, appear in the consciousness of the pogromists as a weakening of Soviet power because they diminish its adherents."

If the Jews had occupied a dominant position in the Soviet administration from the outset, the Soviet government itself exploited this fact in a way that only had to reinforce the population's view of the equality of Soviet power and Jewish rule. Since the Russian population showed little accommodation to the Bolsheviks, they had to rely in the first period on the broadest support from the Jews. In order to win over the Jewish petty-bourgeois masses, who were still distant from Communism, the following "maneuver" was made, reported by the Jewish publicist Nossig. (71 72 73) During the civil wars, the Bolshevik agents, who preceded the Red Army, themselves saw to the spread of the Jewish character of Bolshevism and thus nourished the hopes of the Jewish population for the advantages to be expected from the Communists. By the fact of the Jewification of the Soviets they gave themselves

"the appearance that Bolshevism is a Jewish cause, an enterprise which has no other purpose than the establishment of the rule of the Jews under the banner of Communism." (7)

As an example, reference was made to the five-pointed star as a symbol of Bolshevism. In addition, on all railroad stations and public places in abundance hung the pictures of the Bolshevik leaders Lenin, Trotsky and Zinoviev, two of whom - were Jews.

Thus, already at the beginning of Soviet rule, a fierce anti-Jewish movement had seized all strata of the population, even the party. A conception of the vast extent of this movement, which seized the people with the tremendous force of an elementary movement when they saw their revolution in the hands of the Jews, is gained from Maslow's notes. Maslow writes: (78)

"Hostility to the Jews is one of the very sharpest features on the face of contemporary Russia, perhaps the very sharpest. Hostility to the Jews is everywhere: in the North, in the South, in the East, in the West. Neither the level of intellectual development, nor party affiliation, nor gender, nor age protect

against it. I do not know whether not even the general moral feeling of the contemporary Russian man is a sufficient security against it. Even belonging to Judaism does not protect against hatred of Jews. The last assertion probably seems strange to the reader, perhaps even nonsensical. In my notes alone there are passages which allow to make this assertion. There is written down a sentence which a well-known Jew in public life and a high Soviet official uttered in a conversation with me:

I am not surprised at the persecutions and pogroms against the Jews. The behavior of the Jews themselves makes them necessary and legal. One would have to deny the Russian population any capacity for resistance and any activity if they did not organize them." (Blocking H. F.)

Indicative of the change in their attitude toward the Jews, even among numerous Russian revolutionaries who knew no hostility to the Jews until the Bolshevik overthrow, is the following record of Maslow:

"While traveling abroad, I had to stay for a long time

with a social revolutionary who came from the working class. The greatest dark spot I see in my life," he said, drawing a line under the path he had taken so far, "is the defense of the Jews. As long as I did not know them, I was their most ardent defender, now I have been living with them for several years, I have recognized them and I cannot forgive myself for my earlier defense.

The activity of hostility towards Jews is also clearly evident in the middle class. About two different cases, two members of this stratum, both particularly soft and sensitive people, who had never in their lives acted physically against others, Maslow reports the following. When, during a conversation on the Jewish question around the time of the suppression of the Kronstadt uprising, the possibility of an overthrow of Soviet power was discussed, in both cases such fierce hatred and enmity against the Jews suddenly appeared in the persons concerned that Maslow had no doubt; both would actively participate in the extermination of the Jews in the event of an overthrow.

In the lowest developed stratum of the Russian population, hostility to the Jews took on the character of a pure war of extermination. When in Ukraine the insurgents attacked the trains, the command frequently resounded in the carriages: Communists and Jews out! Those who responded to the command were shot right by the wagons, sometimes even directly on the platform. More often, however, the command was not given, but the raiders began to examine the papers, and it was not immediately clear who was in control, the insurgents or the Soviet

Yaroslavsky (Gubelmann)

does. If the face, papers, or language of one or another of the travelers raised a doubt during the inspection as to his belonging to the Russian nationality, the custom had become established of forcing the suspects to pronounce the word "kukurusa" (corn). If the "r" was pronounced purely, the person suspected of Jewishness was left in peace; in the opposite case, he was led away without argument and shot.⁷⁴)

In order to understand the justification of a movement of such magnitude and strength among the Russian population, one must not forget that the Jews were not only the actual rulers, but that most of them were at the very lowest level of culture. The still very young assimilation process in Russia had managed to,

"to depress deeply the moral cultural level of a considerable part of our people and to bring up a generation which in degeneracy surpasses our assimilation type in all other countries and which, as an outgrowth of national depravity, represents an ethically and aesthetically downright frightening deformity" ⁷⁵) (Blocking H. F.).

If we add to this the strong sense of belonging of the Jew, who always prefers the tribesman, the intolerable Jewish presumption and the ruthless Jewish push, we get the type of the thousands of Jewish Soviet employees and commissars who had the administration in their hands.

As Maslow reports, these traits appeared constantly in daily life and in the most varied forms. They were especially noticeable in an accumulation of employees in government agencies that either paid a higher salary or offered unlimited opportunities for large and numerous bribes. If the hiring of employees in such an authority was in the hands of Jews, the entire stock of employees in only semi-responsible posts was Jewish! If the head of such an authority, a Jew, entered at a time when the budget was already completed, Jewish employees followed in dense crowds, even if this influx resulted in the disruption of the budget.

The same preference for his fellow tribesman, often in a manner grossly offensive to the others, was shown by the Jew in queuing of all kinds: at the labor exchange, at the grocery store, when boarding the train, at the distribution points of the various authorities, and the like. The Jew writes to the Jew outside the line. receives him, lets him on the platform, writes out the order if the other has not been cleared, etc.

It is characteristic that later the struggle against Zinoviev and Kamenev, who were at the head of the Leningrad and Moscow Soviets, was conducted under the slogan "against satrapy in the party". In 1920, generous embezzlement was discovered in the "Main Office for Manufactured and Commodity Goods." Entire lots of furs, jewelry, art objects, etc. were missing. Most of the receivables on the basis of which the goods were delivered were signed by Kamenev. Skljanski enjoyed the reputation of the first buyer of diamonds in Russia, and Steklov was currently considered the third richest man in Russia. Steklov was currently named the third richest man in Soviet Russia.

The "economic" interests of many communist leaders often turned into greedy avarice, and "then began a ruthless acquisition in their own interest, from the petitioners, the state money, from the whole population. Representatives and bearers of this economic motive, which turned into an intolerable greed of accumulation, were in the tops Zinoviev, Skljanski, etc. Their imitators in the middle and lower regions were without number." ⁷⁶)

This type of big and small Jewish Soviet rulers is characterized by the Jews themselves with sufficient

clarity. In the organ of the Russian Zionists, Hezrani wrote on the occasion of Gorky's coming forward for Bolshevism:77)

"Indeed, what does Gorky say? In essence, he says only that to the growth of anti-Semitism in So w j etruß1 and the Jewish Bolsheviks themselves contribute by their in many cases tactless conduct. But surely this is the sacred truth! (Blocking in original.)

.... But one can and must speak of that mass type of Communist Jew who fills all kinds of colleges and presidiums, who stands at the head of the small and medium-sized Soviet organs, who by the nature of his activity comes into daily uninterrupted contact with the broadest masses of the population. These common "Soviet workers" of large and small caliber . . . are huge cadres of "former..." freshly sprouted post-October seed, renegades of the Zionist factions, all kinds of "believers" and "matured" . . . their number is, undoubtedly, very large, but the main thing - they occupy the foremost positions . . .**

Soviet power, Maslow writes, emerges more strongly with its negative features as soon as it is in the hands of Jews:

"The Jews are ruder, more insolent, more thievish, more haughty, and the population is treated worse by them. Among the various groups of representatives of the Soviet power, the Jewish one proves to be the most unpleasant and the most severe when meeting them" (blocking H. F.).

. . . The consequences were terrible. Pasmanik, a notable former Zionist leader in Russia, characterizes the justification of these consequences with unsurpassable clarity: 78)

"One must understand the psychology of the Russian people when they suddenly feel over them the domination of this foul-mouthed nastiness, which is haughty and coarse, self-confident and insolent. It is necessary to react to the crimes of the waste of our people with the most energetic means." (Blocking H. F.)

This reaction was manifested in pogroms and slaughter of Jews, which were monstrous even by Russian standards. Even the Red troops were not excluded, not to mention the persecutions of Jews by the counterrevolution.

The Jews paid double for their intolerable rule. The peasants in the Soviet area took revenge on the Jews for all the tribulations of the communist power. As a result, the Jews only clung more firmly to Soviet power and greeted with joy every appearance of the Reds. Often the Jewish quarters in the former settlement area were the only places where people rejoiced at the coming of the Reds. If then the Bolsheviks were defeated and the Whites or the Greens followed,7Ö) pogroms began, for the Jews had just shown themselves to be the most ardent defenders of Soviet power. In Shitomir, every government and almost every invasion began with a pogrom.

From the Jewish side it is claimed that the anti-Semitic propaganda of the counterrevolution unleashed the pogroms. It is true that a large part of the atrocities can be traced back to this, but in the first place the general mood of pogroms was caused solely by the fact of Jewish domination, which, moreover, expressed itself in a way that had to affect the population most severely. The anti-Jewish propaganda of the Whites therefore only had to point to these facts in order to unleash a wild hatred of the Jews in the troops already stirred up by the fratricidal war.

The persecutions and slaughters therefore reached tremendous proportions. According to the reports of the Eastern Jewish Historical Archive in Berlin, the following pogroms and their organizers in the Ukraine from the fall of 1917 to April 1921 have been documented:

Characteristic of the general mood of hatred against the Jews is that at the same time that the national Ukrainian government of Petlyura was constituted, the Jews were given personal autonomy and took a lively part in general Ukrainian politics, pogroms and persecutions of Jews began throughout the Ukraine. In the above figures, the national Petlyura army is in the first place with 40 per cent of all

pogroms and with 55.7 per cent of all killed.

This is followed, both by the number of pogroms and victims, by the insurgent detachments and gangs that emerged directly from the bosom of the Revolution as an outrage against Bolshevism and the Jews. Only in third place came the counter-revolutionary and anti-Jewish Denikin Army, and then the Red Army. There were also pogroms of the Red troops already in the first Bolshevik winter, so in Glukhov, Novgorod-Seversk and other places. When the Reds fled from the German troops, the Jewish patches, especially in the northeastern districts of Chernigov

Governorate, became the scene of the wildest Jewish slaughters. The Soviet power concealed the atrocities of Glukhov and Novgorod-Seversk and blamed them on the Whites.

The famous cavalry army of the Red General Budenny was also among the most furious pogromshchiks. When it was thrown over from the Polish front into the Crimea against Wrangel, its path was marked with countless pogroms, murders, rapes and plunderings. Finally, the Soviet government was so aware of the mood of this force that their quarters were never again placed in Ukraine, never again did their path pass through there.

But all these thousands of raids and murders were committed with an eerie calm:

"What was striking," Maslow writes, "about all these pogroms – the Petlyurz ones, the Polish ones, the Soviet ones – was the large number of those murdered. Jews were beaten to death in the tsarist period as well, but never so many, and one did not kill with such calm, almost soullessness." ⁸¹)

It may be that the mental equilibrium of the pogromists was not disturbed because the extermination of the Jews did not occur solely as a result of agitation, not solely in an artificially generated state of excitement, but largely as a result of decades of knowledge of the Jew and suffering under his exploitative economic methods. What came to elemental fruition in the chaos of revolution and civil wars was a terrible reckoning, an outburst of bitter experiences accumulated for generations, to which was added, as the last and heaviest, Jewish domination of Bolshevism. Dostoevsky writes:

"Ask the native population in our borderlands: what moves the Jew and what moved him throughout the centuries? You will get the unanimous answer: mercilessness . . .

. . . And indeed, the whole activity of the Jews in these frontier areas was to make the native population as dependent on themselves as possible, taking advantage of the local laws."

Chapter Two

Epoch of the struggle for the Madht

(1923–1927)

Stalin – Trotsky.

The first bulletin on Lenin's illness, signed by five physicians and the People's Commissar for Health, appeared in "Pravda" of June 4, 1922. Lenin had finally disappeared from the political arena, and the bitter and continuing "struggle for power," for leadership in the party, began. As long as the outcome of Lenin's illness was uncertain, this struggle manifested itself in open and hidden intrigues among the opponents. But when it became clear that Lenin's condition was hopeless, and even more so after his death, the clash of rivals created a terrible storm in the party, which for almost five years, until the end of 1927, kept the entire Communist Party in a state of tremendous tension.

The pretenders to Lenin's succession were three influential members of the Politburo: Zinoviev and Kamenev, both Jews, and Stalin, a Georgian. Kamenev, also a Jew and a member of the Politburo, was in solidarity with Zinoviev and acted in concert with him. Among the four high party leaders who aspired to Lenin's position, three were – Jews. The Jews already had such a position of power that they could reach for official rule over Soviet Russia with a chance of success.

If Zinoviev and Kamenev had joined forces with Trotsky from the outset, and not only when Stalin already had the upper hand in the party, they might have been able to realize their intention. For the

party could withstand the united onslaught of the "oppositional bloc" only by mustering all its forces. Thus, however, each of them individually, borne by an immoderate sense of power, strove for leadership for himself alone.

When Lenin withdrew from work in June 1922, with the tacit consent of the Central Committee, leadership in the party passed to the threesome, to the following "core" of the party:

Zinoviev (Jew), Kamenev (Jew), Stalin (Georgian).¹⁾

These three ruled from mid-1922 to the end of 1925; that is, for 3½ years the center of Soviet power was in the hands of a triumvirate, two members of which were Jews.

But unlike the troika of 1918, Lenin, Sverdlov, Stalin, which by virtue of Lenin's authority constituted a coherent whole, this power of three soon proved to be an internally artificial construction. As early as April 1923, i.e., the 12th Party Congress, Stalin's struggle against Zinoviev for influence in the party began in its midst, and Trotsky, as the third power, opened an underground war against the total nucleus. Each of the three opponents, who had reconciled themselves to "collegiality" in the administration during Lenin's illness, aspired to the first place in the party for himself alone.

But the struggle for leadership was not only a personal question of power; here two principles were fighting with each other. Stalin and the other supporters of "centralism," the iron discipline in the party, were opposed by the defenders of "democracy. These two directions already existed before the seizure of power, but now, when after the 12th Party Congress the news of Lenin's hopeless condition spread throughout the party, the opposition appeared with particular vehemence. Lenin's illness had opened up to it the prospect of freeing itself from the chains of "centralism."

Stalin's opponents in the struggle for power used this movement as an "umbrella," placed themselves at the head of the opposition under the slogan of "democracy" and sought with its help to eliminate the "ruling core" and ultimately the entire CC. Thus it happened that the Jewish opponents of Stalin also became leaders of the opposition at the same time. (To the aforementioned three was added, as a fourth, the Jew Radek).

The main demand of the opposition was inner-party "democracy," i.e., the right of free discussion and the right to form factions within the Bolshevik framework. But Gurian²⁾ very correctly remarks on this: when Trotsky made the demand for free expression of opinion within the party, he was in reality very far from granting intraparty or even general freedom of speech and of the press. Had he won, he would have dealt with Stalin just as "undemocratically" as the dictator dealt with him. Only because he no longer possessed

power (in 1923 the chairmanship of the Revolutionary War Council was only a post of honor), he made the demand for freedom of discussion.

Especially during the civil wars, Trotsky often showed himself to be a man of terror: his constant response to any expression of a free will opinion was "punish relentlessly". Well-known is his cruel reprimand of a peaceful workers' demonstration in Astrakhan in March 1919, where 2000 workers were shot in response to a demand for an increase in wages in kind.³⁾ Likewise, Trotsky was the person responsible for the bloody suppression of the Kronstadt uprising in the spring of 1921. Trotsky in particular, who had already caused a great stir in the summer of 1918 by shooting the naval officer Shchastnyi, "played a decisive role in the introduction of terrorist methods in the struggle against the political opponent".⁴⁾

The same is true of Zinoviev. If in the October days he had still spoken out against the armed insurrection and against the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks and in favor of a coalition government of all socialist parties, he very soon changed his mind after Lenin's victory. As the all-powerful governor of Petrograd, he had 500 hostages shot indiscriminately in Petrograd alone after the assassination of Uritski in August 1918.^{5 *}

The principle of "centralism" was advocated by Stalin and his followers, who, in the spirit of Lenin, had always put up the greatest resistance to the introduction of "democracy." The slightest loosening of discipline, they said, would endanger the unity of the party, which could only exercise rule over the great mass of the nonpartisans as a "monolith," a solidly locked rock-hard body. Since Lenin's death (1924), 300,000 new party members had joined out of a party membership of 772,000 in 1925. It was particularly contrary to Stalin's nature to allow the new elements to discuss questions that threatened the party's existence. Especially since the movement of the opposition at times came to such a head that "it seemed as if the fate of the USSR hung on a hair."

In the Stalin-Trotsky struggle, two types of Bolshevik leaders finally faced each other. As Gurian⁷) rightly notes, since the founding of the party there have been the two types: one is the revolutionary literate, the revolutionary theoretician, and the other is the revolutionary practitioner. Among the revolutionary theoreticians, who were mostly of intellectual origin, were numerous Jewish men and women who could not sufficiently pursue their need for recognition under the old regime.

The Jewish Bolsheviks, who were at the forefront of the opposition and emerged as the most ardent exponents of revolutionary theory and doctrine, also belonged to this type. This remarkable fact is also underlined by the renowned Jewish scholar Brutzkus:

"It is characteristic that the most important leaders of the opposition in the CP. were precisely men of Jewish descent: thus Trotsky (Bronstein), Zinoviev (Radomyslski), Kamenev (Rosenfeld), Radek (Sobelsohn). This bears eloquent witness to the extreme revolutionary doctrinarianism of the Jewish Communists.⁴⁴ H) (Blocking H. F.)

The other type of Bolshevik leader is the revolutionary-practitioner. Usually he is a worker or a peasant. He is not inclined to theoretical discussions and musings on the foundations of the party to which he once belonged. For him, practical work is decisive, agitation among the workers, setting up the secret printing presses, etc. He is inferior to the agile revolutionary literati in political discussion, but he surpasses them in unambiguity, energy and straightforwardness.

While the revolutionary theorists dreamed of an immediate outbreak of the world revolution, the practitioners found it necessary to prepare

it, if necessary in years of work. The difference between revolutionary theorists and revolutionary practitioners, then, was not that some demanded world revolution while others "renounced" it, but that some intended the construction of socialism only after world revolution had been completed, while others first wanted "socialist construction⁴⁴ in the already dominated area, in order to be able to tackle world revolution from this platform more securely and with more promise of success. The difference between the two directions is thus not one of principle but of tactics.

Stalin won. In the grueling struggle, his greater energy, his enormous clarity of purpose, his slow, controlled and methodical approach won the day. His victory led to a gradual domination of the practitioner type, to a strangulation of freedom of discussion. There was no more room for discussion, the conception of the party as a coercive machine triumphed over all attempts to turn it into a school of mutually educating people. What mattered most was the ability to work and organize, for which performance and not instantaneous visible effects were decisive. In the long run, therefore, the thoroughly unspiritual but all the more energetic revolutionary practitioner triumphed over the revolutionary romantic and literate.

The attempt of the Jewish leaders to seize official rule over Russia failed. The national Russian forces, which had strengthened during the revolutionary years, grouped around Stalin as conscious opponents of the Jewish-led opposition. They saw in Stalin the bearer of a socialism that was to be realized in the Soviet Union regardless of the world situation. In addition, since Lenin's death there had been a change in the attitude of leading party circles toward anti-Semitism. During the struggles for power, taking into

account the changed mood, some Jewish Communists begin to disappear from the widely visible places. This is true first of all, of course, of Stalin's personal opponents: thus Trotsky had already been forced to take a "recuperative vacation" in the Caucasus at the beginning of 1924; in 1925 Kamenev is relegated from among the members of the Politburo and Sokolnikov is expelled from the Politburo. Finally, at the July 1926 plenum, Zinoviev, Trotsky and Kamenev are finally expelled from the Politburo. Then, when Zinoviev and Kamenev also joined the opposition after losing their positions of power, respected party leaders adopted a stridently anti-Semitic attitude.

Undoubtedly, Stalin consciously tolerated the growth of anti-Semitism in the party in the struggle against the Trotskyists. This then gave rise to the false view of Stalin's hostility to the Jews. To us it seems much more correct that Stalin's support of the movement against the Jews was only a tactical move to consolidate his position among the Russian element and with its help to crush Trotskyism. Stalin spared no means in the struggle for supremacy and left no force unused.

In particular, we note that he enlisted several important Jewish party leaders as his closest collaborators and directed them to high party posts, some of them still under Lenin. Thus at his instigation at the 10th Party Congress (1921) Yaroslavsky became one of the 3 secretaries of the Central Committee. After the 12th Party Congress (1923) Yaroslavsky received the special post of secretary of the Central Control Commission and became a member of the Presidium of the CC, Stalin's strongest weapon in the struggle against the opposition. Kuibyshev became chairman of the CCC and People's Commissar of the RKI. (Workers' and Peasants' Inspectorate), Gusev became the main secretary of the CCC after the 13th Party Congress (1924), and Kaganovich and Selensky became secretaries in the CCC Secretariat, which had only 4 members and of which Stalin was the general secretary. The latter two also became members of the Organ Bureau of the CC. Chubin was given (in 1924) the extremely important post of assistant to the head of the Organization and Distribution Department in the Secretariat of the CC, which had been reformed according to Stalin's own plans. Among the exclusive duties of this post was the observation and spying on the employees of the People's Commissariats and all central and local party, trade union, and economic organs and the determination of their attitude toward Stalin.

Numerous Jews worked in the most important party and state posts, especially in the years 1923-1927. Stalin would not have let them be elected if he were an anti-Semite, because from 1923 the gradual permanent reshuffling of party organs begins almost exclusively according to his will.

At the 15th Party Congress in December 1927, the opposition was crushed. Partly before the Party Congress, partly at the Party Congress itself, a total of 100 leading opposition members, including many Jews, were expelled from the Party and in some cases punished with banishment or imprisonment.

Trotsky was shipped to Turkestan and expelled from the Soviet Union in January 1929. Zinoviev and Kamenev make declarations of repentance and are sent to the provinces only for this; soon, however, they are readmitted to the party and entrusted with minor posts. Radek was sent to Tomsk for a year, then he also repented and today he is again an agitator and foreign propagandist.

Now, after the victory over the opposition, have the Jews been ousted from the Bolshevik leadership? To answer this question, we examine the transformation of the structure and composition of the supreme party and state apparatus as it emerged in the epoch of the "struggle for power." 8a)

The Central Committee.

During the epoch of the struggle for power, the structure of the Bolshevik party and state apparatus underwent a period of reforms, after the completion of which almost nothing remained of its original form given to it by Lenin.

The reasons for these reforms lay exclusively in the struggles for leadership that dominated the party and state life of the epoch. Stalin's intention in the reforms was to create for himself an apparatus with which he could crush the opposition and seize power. He succeeded completely in this intention. After the

reforms were completed, the ruling group in the party, and Stalin in particular, possessed an instrument with which he squeezed not only the party but also the entire state life of the country as if in a vice. At the beginning of the struggles for power, Stalin was initially powerless in the Politburo, where Zinoviev had a majority thanks to the support of Kamenev and Bukharin. But thanks to the majority in his favor in the Central Committee at the 12th Party Congress (1923), Stalin pushed through a resolution on limiting the powers of the Politburo and transferring decisions on all major issues to the Central Committee. In this way Stalin detached himself from the influence of the Politburo and at the same time increased the powers and prestige of the CC. in which he had a majority.

The Politburo v e r l o s t its paramount position, which it had had under Lenin, and the center of Soviet power in this epoch passed to the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

But this, too, happened only gradually. At the beginning of the leaders' struggles, Zinoviev initially had the majority on his side, even in the Central Committee. Stalin countered this preponderance by seeking to increase the number of his supporters at the expense of increasing the total number of the Central Committee. His intention succeeded, and at the 12th Party Congress, thanks to a majority for Stalin, the total number of members of the Central Committee was substantially increased by the election of a number of Stalin's most devoted supporters. Among the newly elected candidates of the Central Committee at this party congress we note in particular Kaganovich (Jew), who, belonging to Stalin's immediate environment, herewith appears for the first time among the higher party leaders. Today, next to Stalin, he plays the first role in the Soviet leadership.

Stalin maintained the tactic of electing more supporters to the Central Committee at the expense of increasing the total number of members of the Central Committee during the next party congresses. The number of members of the CC, and thus the majority for Stalin, increased from one party congress to the next. The importance of the Central Committee, which had been diminished under Lenin in favor of the Politburo, now grew again, so that in this epoch the Central Committee, in which the forces of Stalin, the coming ruler, were gathered, and the Central Committee became the most important party organs. The weight of the Central Committee was especially increased by the fact that since the 12th Party Congress the entire party and government work was imposed on the united plenums of the Central Committee and the Central Committee.

Let us now examine the movement of the Jewish part on the basis of the following table on the national composition of the Central Committee.⁸⁾

National Composition of the Central Committee of the CP.
(1923-1927)

First of all, it should be noted that in the course of the period the Jewish share in the total membership of the Central Committee continued to maintain its slightly decreasing tendency as a result of the slow push of the non-Jewish element. The average proportion of Jews in the Central Committee fell from 25.7% during Lenin's era (1917-1922) to 20.2% in the second era (1923-1927). Thus, on average for the epoch, one-fifth of all members of the CC were Jews.

However, a closer look reveals the following: The decrease of the two averages amounts to 21.4 per cent. But this is exactly as much as the average Jewish share in the Central Committee of the Lenin period decreased in comparison with the average Jewish share in the Central Committee during the preparatory period

(21.3 per cent).

That is to say: despite the struggle against the Trotskyists influenced by anti-Semitic currents, the percentage decrease of the average Jewish share in the CC. during the years 1923-1927 in relation to the Lenin epoch remained exactly the same as the decrease of the corresponding values of the Lenin epoch in relation to the preparatory period. If the average share of Jews in the Central Committee decreased by

21.3 percent in the Lenin era compared to the preparatory period, this share decreased by exactly the same amount (21.4 percent) in the years 1923–1927 compared to the Lenin era. Thus, despite the anti-Semitic currents during the struggles for power, the Jewish element in the Central Committee of the Communist Party did not decrease at all. If the total number of members of the Central Committee increased by about 100 per cent, the Jewish share followed it at a small distance with 75 per cent. This process becomes even clearer if one considers the dynamics of the Jewish share in the Central Committee within the two epochs individually. From 34.8 per cent in 1918 it fell by 3.1 per cent to 24 per cent in 1922, and from 21.2 per cent in 1923 it fell by only 14.1 per cent to 18.3 per cent in 1927.¹⁰) Thus the influx of the Jewish element into the Central Committee is even greater in the period of the struggle for power than in the period of Lenin. This happens because the Central Committee now received the main importance in the party and state leadership, along with the CEC. The following diagram 2 shows the percentage of Jews in the Central Committee: The weaker decrease, i.e. the stronger increase of the Jewish share in the CC. in the second epoch in comparison with the epoch of Lenin is clearly visible: The Jewish share keeps at an almost constant level.

One sees particularly clearly the stronger influx of Jews, in Stalin's CC. *t>ei the movement untei* the Jewish kan d-i - d a t e s* of the CC. The candidacy forms, so to speak, the entrance gate of every party organ, so that one recognizes first and foremost from the movement in this entrance gate which elements flow in or out of the organ and to what extent. The proportion of Jewish candidates to the Central Committee has increased extraordinarily since 1923: in the Lenin era, on the other hand, it decreased.

Among the newly elected candidates of the Central Committee, the Jewish share rose from 11.8% (1923) by 6.5% to 22% in 1927. (In the Lenin era, however, it fell by 56.8%.) The leap from the 12th Party Congress to the 13th Party Congress is particularly enormous: here the share of Jewish candidates increased from 11.8% to 26.4%, i.e. by a whole 123%! So just after the 12th Party Congress, where the Central Committee began to develop as the instrument of the coming ruler through the election of a whole series of Stalin's followers, the proportion of Jews in the Central Committee more than doubled! At the same time, this increase is greater than the increase in the total number of candidates – the Jewish share thus grows directly at the expense of the non-Jewish candidates.

On the other hand, the Russian share among the candidates for the same period increased only by 25.5%, and among the non-Jewish foreigners it even decreased.

foreign peoples it even decreased. Moreover, this downward movement among the candidates among all non-Jews continued throughout the epoch: if in 1923 29.4% of the candidates were of non-Jewish origin, in 1927 it was only 10%. The share of Russian candidates, after a temporary increase to 59%, remained almost constant at 47% in this period.

The proportion of Jewish candidates alone has increased by more than two-thirds of its original stock. These changes in the national composition of the candidate pool are clearly seen in the following Diagram 3, in which the percentages of nationalities among the candidates of the CC. are recorded. The strong increase of the Jewish element and the decrease of the non-Jewish one stands out clearly.

The fact that the proportion of Jews in the total membership of the Central Committee, at 20 percent, exceeds their proportion in the party mass (4.3 percent in 1927) by a factor of four and a half is again a well-known phenomenon, namely, that the Jews are many times more highly represented in the leadership than in the organization of the mass. The proportion of Jews in the population of the Soviet Union, which according to the census of December 1926 was 1.77 per cent, is exceeded even elevenfold. As a result of our study of the movement of the Jewish share in the Central Committee, it emerges that despite the attitude of the ruling group in the party, which was strongly influenced by anti-Semitic

sentiments, during the struggles against the opposition, the Jews have asserted themselves more strongly in the CC. than in the epoch of Lenin. Thus, in the very body that Stalin's reforms moved to the center of power, the Jews took a broad and firm place in time and retained it to the same extent even after the destruction of the Trotskyists. There can be no question, therefore, of the Central Committee of the Communist Party pushing back the Jews after the defeat of the opposition.

The Central Control Commission.

Aleksandrov's opinion: "The importance of the CCC. and the CC. in the life of the USSR, has not been appreciated at all by the political circles of émigrés", has full validity also for all other non-Soviet political circles. "Meanwhile," says Aleksandrov with full justification, "only the CCC. under Stalin's leadership saved Soviet power from overthrow, since it alone saved the party from splitting. Not appreciated also is the importance of the CCC. in organizing the Soviet apparatus and especially in administering both the party and the country."

Their exclusive position the ZKK. and the KK. (Control Commissions) did not receive it from the outset. They were initially created as organs with completely undefined powers and functions, but over the years they have become more and more complete, until in 1928 they developed into a powerful, all-encompassing party and government organ.

The CCC and the CC were officially set up under Lenin to fight against the criminal element in the party, which was assuming enormous proportions. Unofficially, however, the new control body was created to fight the opposition. As is well known, the opposition to the ruling group appeared already at the beginning of the Soviet rule and took a particularly dangerous form in 1920 as the "workers' opposition".¹¹⁾

One of the most important provisions of the CCC. stated that members of the control commissions could not at the same time be members of the CCC. and could not hold administrative posts. This provision was made in order to prevent the CC from developing into a "supreme body" over the Central Committee. Later, when the ruling group became convinced that the Control Commissions could work in parallel with the Central Committee, the ban on simultaneous membership of the Central Committee and the Commissions corresponded to another intention, namely to give the Commissions greater independence.

In the short time leading up to the 12th Party Congress, Stalin had managed to significantly expand the powers of the CC. At this Party Congress, Shkiryatov, a leading member of the CCC, was able to report on the following extensions of the CCC's powers, which already existed in practice:¹²⁾

1. the control of party membership, on the duration of which the career of party members depended, was transferred exclusively to the powers of the CCC.

2. the jurisdiction of the CCC was extended territorially, including the affairs of members of foreign missions.

3. the investigative department of the CCC was expanded. The investigators were distributed among the counties, and the work of the governorate CCC was under the control of the investigators.

The CCC was able to fully centralize its activities in the field of supervision of party members. The CCC began to work not only with the courts, but also with the OGPU and the PUR. (Political Administration of the Revolutionary War Council).

Shkiryatov: "... In the GPU. is our investigator; as soon as the matter of a communist is handed over to the GPU. it is conducted by the investigator of the KK. himself..." The investigating officer at the PUR. conducts the affairs of military comrades and then brings them to the Conflict Commission, which makes one decision or another on the matter of the comrade in question. Then these matters are negotiated in the CCC. and there they are finally decided."

- 5 By fighting against the oppositionists and imposing severe punishments on them, the CCC. at the

same time protected the party members who were devoted to it and necessary for it. This protection went so far that the practice had become established of exempting party members who had to stand trial for criminal offenses from court and punishment if they only obediently complied with the ruling group's line. In very vague phrases Shkiryatov said about it the following:

Shkiryatov: "Having acquainted ourselves with the judicial material, we saw that a comrade had not been put in the dock in the interests of our Party; that there was no material about him which, from the Party's point of view, allowed him to be handed over to the court . . . these matters we sometimes submitted to the

CC, so that it would contact the relevant judicial body: was it worthwhile to take this matter to court? But in doing so, we in no way exerted any pressure on the judicial body in question." (12. – S. 221.)

From this report of Shkiryatov's we see what a power Stalin had already transferred to the CCC. and with what energy it began to work.

At the 12th Party Congress in 1923, the CCC was fundamentally reformed. First of all, it was merged with another body, the RKI. The

thus united powerful control organ was then given an extraordinarily important new function, namely the "reorganization of the entire state apparatus on a completely new basis".¹⁾

In accordance with this general objective, the following comprehensive control tasks, among others, were transferred to the ZKK. and the RKI: ". . . b) Essentially, the evaluation and examination of the work of the leaders and employees of the state and economic organs; support of the state and the party through the selection of the personally leading staff; . . . c) Investigating and finding out the causes of criminal and illegal activities of the leaders and employees of the state apparatus . . d) Practical and theoretical study of the administration, finding out the mistakes and merits of the administrative organs . . e) Particularly careful improvement of the state apparatus and the economic organs, unremitting punishment of state officials . . f) Systematic and systematic use of the Soviet and Party press for the detection and conviction of all kinds of crimes, such as prowling, bribery, and systematic circumvention of the Party's basic line by reorganizing the state apparatus. , "14)

The resolution on the special work of the CCC. in its struggle against the opposition emphasizes even more clearly the supervision of all p a r t e i m i t g l i e d :

"The basic task of the CCC. is to ensure in every respect the Party line'in the activity of all Soviet organs. "10)

To fully understand these provisions, it must be taken into account that the ruling group of the Party had recognized that the opposition was mainly concentrated among the highestp

Soviet and economic officials. On the basis of the provisions of the CCC, it was now possible to dismiss not only all materially unsuitable officials, but also opposition party men under the pretext of their material unsuitability.

In accordance with this enormous increase in tasks, the number of ZKK members was raised from 7 to 50 and the number of candidates from 2 to 10. A special 9-member Presidium of the CCC was elected from the members of the CCC with the longest possible party membership. The plenary sessions of the CCC were set once in two months immediately before the plenum of the Central Committee. The Central Committee sent its representatives to these meetings in an advisory capacity. The members and candidates of the CCC, in turn, were given the right to participate in the All-Russian Conferences in an advisory capacity,¹⁶⁾ and the Presidium of the CCC was given the right to participate in the meetings of the Plenum of the CC. 3 representatives of the Presidium of the CCC. received the right of participation in the meetings of the Politburo s.¹⁷⁾

A special "P a r t - kollegium" (party collegium) was elected from among the members of the ZKK. for the judicial investigation of the affairs of party members who were held responsible by the ZKK. -

This is the essence of the new reform. As can be seen, the CCC acquired extraordinary importance in the life of the party and the state as a whole. It

". . . became the communist eye and ear of the ruling group and especially of Stalin, an institution which not only monitored the activity and political physiognomy of every communist and conducted the investigation of all transgressions of party members, but it was also the court which made decisions and imposed punishments against which there was no possibility of appeal. The ZKK. became a special GPU. for the Communists both in terms of its activity and its structure".¹⁸⁾

The chairman of this GPU. for the Communists became Kuibyshev (Jew), who had become Stalin's right-hand man since the 11th Party Congress (1922). His closest collaborators were the members of the Presidium of the CCC, who directed the entire work of the CCC, and the Party Collegium, whose special task was the condemnation of the oppositionists.

The structure of the CCC. was established according to the "Provision on the CCC. of the CPR. (b)" of January 2, 1925, as follows: The CCC. is elected by the Party Congress with a membership of 151 members with the longest party or Soviet affiliation; the l e a d i n g of the CCC. was formed by 3 organs: the Presidium, the Secretariat, and the Party Collegium with a membership of ie 7-20 members. Thanks to its superior position, the CEC had gradually taken over the handling of all important issues in both party life and state building. Thus, in his speech at the 13th Party Congress in 1924, Kuibyshev was able to report the following about the work of the CCC:

Kuibyshev: "The clear tendency is noticeable that in the majority of cases the larger and more important questions are first handed over to the b e - a r b e i t by the C C C . ; then they are decided upon after the report of the C C C . and the representatives of the corresponding departments and authorities in the Politburo . . . "1B *)

In the field of supervision of Party members, the last reform of the 13th Party Congress brought centralism to perfection and squeezed the whole Party on the vast territory of the USSR, "as in a fist".

The Union was divided into rayons, headed by the members of the Party College as the main supervisors. Since Moscow was the center of opposition at the time, this rayon was given special emphasis and two main inquisitors of the Party College were placed at its head:²⁰⁾ Yaroslavsky (Jew) was given special supervision over the universities and Solyts (Jew) over the rest of the Moscow rayon. Panov (?) received the PUR., the Caucasus, Transcaucasia and the Southeast; Zakharova (Russian) - the Urals and Siberia; Vasilyeva (?) - the Northwest Territory; K r u m i n (Jew)²¹⁾ - Ukraine, Crimea and the Western Territory; Filler (Jew) - the national republics and Turkestan.

Thus, of the 7 main controllers of the party for the entire Union, 4 were - Jews (57.2 per cent). In addition, the Jews, as the chief supervisors of the ruling group of the party in its struggle against the opposition - at its head were also Jews. Both the leaders of the opposition and the top leaders of the party organ, which had the greatest powers to fight them, were mostly Jews. Thanks to their well-known policy of distribution, which they also practiced here, the position of the Jews remained unaffected, no matter what the outcome of the struggle was . . .

At the 15j party congress in 1927, where the opposition was crushed, the ZKK. had an absolutely dominant position. A new overall reconstruction was no longer necessary, since the apparatus was perfectly sufficient for Stalin. Only two important innovations were introduced, which further increased the power of the CCC. The resolution of the 15th Party Congress stipulated that.

"those Party members who refuse to answer truthfully the questions of the CCC will be expelled from the Party without delay." ^{22 23 24)}

Furthermore, the number of members of the CEC was increased once again - to 195 heads - and the number of representatives of the Presidium of the CEC in the Politburo was increased to 4 and 4 candidates. These delegates were given the right of the deciding vote, i.e. they were put on an equal

footing with the members of the Politburo elected by the Plenum of the CC. t.2S * *)

The culmination of Stalin's reform of the party and state apparatus in the epoch of struggle for power was the establishment of a new supreme party organ – the Plenum of the CC. and the CEC. Originally, the joint sessions of the CC. and the CEC were called. Meetings of the "United Plenums of the CC. and the CEC?", as each plenum was considered as a separate organ. Later, these bodies began to merge periodically, and in 1927 they formed a new supreme party and government body with special powers. It was named the "United Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Committee". In particularly important cases, highly representatives of the local CC. and the large local party organizations were called to the meetings of this plenum. "This plenum, consisting of 400 to 500 people, became the supreme party organ at the beginning of 1928; it was above the Polit Office and above the CC, and was the creator of all measures. "34)

*

Let us now examine the national composition of the leadership of the Central Control Commission on the basis of the following table.28) According to the three leading organs of the Central Control Commission, the Presidium, the Secretariat and the Party College, let us first examine each organ separately, then the entire top.

National composition of the Central Control Commission of the CP".

Presidium (1923–1927)

Secretariat

Patkollegium

*) It was not possible to find out the inventory.

1. the Presidium.

The first thing that strikes the eye is the low proportion of Russians in the total membership of the Presidium and the extremely high proportion of Jews. After the 12th Party Congress, half of all members were Russians, but then the Russian share decreased steadily, and after the 15th Party Congress (1927), at the end of the period, it amounted to only a little over one-fifth of the total.

In contrast, the Jewish share starts at 42.8 percent, drops to 23.8 percent after the 13th Party Congress, but then rises again sharply at the expense of the Russians and, rising steadily, amounts to almost 7 percent of the total population at the end of the period. On average during the period, 35.4% of the Russians are Jews, compared to 29.2%. The Jewish share is thus 82.5 % of the Russian! The average of all other non-Russians together is only 17.7 per cent.

The average Jewish share in the Presidium of the CCC. is higher than in the CCC. (20 per cent) during the same period and higher even than in Lenin's period (25.7 per cent).

In detail, the figures on the Jewish share are even higher. Among the members alone, the proportion of Jews after the 12th Party Congress in 1923

is 55.6%, which is higher than the proportion of Russians. Thus, by the 12th Party Congress, during the one year when the CCC had already received great powers before the reform and its future position of power began to emerge, the influx of Jews there was so strong that their share in the CCC Presidium elected at the 11th Party Congress (1922) skyrocketed from 20 percent to 55.6 percent, more than two and a half times.

Equally significant is the movement of the Jewish share among the candidates. Up to the 14th Party Congress in 1925 the proportion of Jews among the candidates was 20 and 22.2 per cent respectively, but after the 15th Party Congress, when the CCC was at the height of its power, it rose by 12.5 per cent to 50 per cent. That is, the increase of the Jewish share among the candidates was directly at the expense of the Russians and all non-Jewish foreign peoples.

This happened just at the 15th Party Congress, where Stalin crushed the opposition, and Trotsky,

Zinoviev and Kamenev disappeared from the political scene. As a result, the opinion arose at that time that the Jews had been ousted from the top of the Bolshevik apparatus. In fact, only the above-mentioned members of the Politburo and their closest supporters disappeared. Therefore, probably in the Politburo, as a result of the expulsion of its Jewish members, the opponents of Stalin, the Jewish element decreased very much, but asserted itself for it in the Central Committee. and even rose in the Central Committee.!!!

That is to say: the Jewish element maintained or even rose in those party and state organs which played the first role and had the greatest importance in this epoch. There is no question of the Jews being pushed back from the Bolshevik leadership after the victory over the opposition, just as in the case of the Central Committee. also in the case of the Presidium of the Central Committee.

2. the Secretariat.

For the Secretariat of the CCC, for which only data from the 13th and 14th party congresses are available, the following results from the analysis of its national composition: on the average of the two party congresses, Russians make up 37.5 percent of the total membership, and non-Jewish foreigners 12.5 percent. However, the average Jewish share is 43.8%, which is higher than the share of Russians! Moreover, it is even higher in the Secretariat than in the Presidium of the CCC: however, in every administration the Secretariat is the body that has under it the practical execution of all the measures of this authority.

If we examine the composition of the secretariat for the two party congresses individually, we find that after the 13th party congress 60 % and after the 14th party congress 75 % of the elected secretaries were Jews! Furthermore, the main secretary of the CCC after the 13th Party Congress was a Jew, i.e. the only post of the main secretary of the CCC among the 37 members of the CCC leadership was occupied by a Jew. Russians did not hold this post at all during the two years.

3. the Party College.

The Partkollegium of the ZKK. had the functions of a GPU. for communists. The Partkollegium was the highest judicial authority for party members, and there was no appeal against its decisions. The Party College dictatorially decided on the composition of the Communist Party. And it is precisely in this Partkollegium that we also note an extraordinarily high proportion of Jews.

The total proportion of Jews in the Party College at the beginning of the epoch is 42.8 per cent, rises to 62.5 per cent, and at the end of the epoch is still 30.8 per cent.

On average for the whole period, the Jewish share in the Partial College is 42.9 percent, which is almost half the average share in the Presidium of the Central Committee. Within the Partial College it is larger than the average share of Russians, which reaches only 34.3%.

Finally, the Secretary of the Party College elected after the 13th Party Congress is Jewish. Of the two secretaries elected after the 15th and 16th Party Congresses, one is a Jew.

The following diagram 4 shows the percentage of Jews in the Presidium, the Secretariat and the Party College of the CCC.

The diagram convincingly shows the superior proportion of Jews in the Partkollegium compared to the other top organs of the ZKK. Furthermore, the curves of the Presidium and Partkollegium of the CCC complement each other: an initially decreasing and later increasing share of Jews in the Presidium corresponds to an initially increasing and then decreasing share in the Partkollegium. As a result, the Jewish share in the entire leadership of the CEC is at an extraordinary level. Moreover, since after the 14th Party Congress the increasing influence is stronger, from 1925 the Jewish share in the entire top of the CCC increases.

This general increase of the Jewish share in the total top of the CCC, i.e. Presidium, Secretariat and Party College together, is shown in the following table:

The Jewish share in the total "head" of the CCC. at the beginning of the period is 42.8 per cent, then decreases as a result of the decrease of the enormous share in the Party College, and after the 15th Party Congress, at which the Trotsky opposition was crushed, increases again to 31.1 per cent. So almost a dr i ttel of all the members of the leadership of the CCC. at the outcome of the struggles for power were Jews. That is, the Jews asserted themselves even more strongly in the Central Control Commission, the most important organ of power in this epoch, than in the Central Committee.

After Stalin's final victory over the Trotskyists at the 15th Party Congress, in the membership of those party organs elected at that Congress, which at that time embodied the supreme Bolshevik power, the Jewish share remained unchanged.

The generally widespread assertion about a pushback of the Jews in the highest Bolshevik positions of power and a reduction of Jewish influence thus does not stand up to close scrutiny. In the more power-politically unimportant party and state positions, it certainly happened that Jews were removed from their posts in consideration of the growing anti-Semitism. This gave rise to the opinion that the Jews were being pushed back in the Soviet leadership.²⁰⁾

But in reality, the emphasis of the Jewish share had long since shifted and, in accordance with the changed significance of the individual party and state organs during the struggles for power, had migrated to the new Bolshevik center, to the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. This process is clearly reflected in the following comparative overview. The Jewish share in the three supreme organs amounted to v. H.:

The Jewish share in the Central Committee, Stalin's all-powerful control and state organ, is consistently significantly higher than in the Politburo. The proportion of Jews in the Central Committee is somewhat lower than in the Politburo, but the total number of members of the Central Committee already exceeded 100 after the 14th Party Congress: however, Jews are always most strongly represented in the highest organs, which have only a few members.

The figures for the 15th Party Congress are particularly characteristic: although the Jewish proportion in the Politburo fell by about half because of the expulsion of the Jewish opposition leaders, it held its own in the ZK. and even rose in the ZKK.

The following diagram 5 shows the process graphically.²⁷⁾

All curves have a common characteristic: a falling tendency (decreasing Jewish share) beginning in 1925 or 1924 is already transformed into a rising one (increasing Jewish share) in 1925 or 1927.

The sharpest drop is in the Politburo because of the exclusion of the Jewish opposition leaders. On the other hand, the curves for the ZK. and the ZKK. are least affected by the general decline at the beginning of the epoch. In these bodies, which were the most important during the years 1923–1927, the Jewish share declined only by 17.4 and 27.4 percent, respectively, from its initial level of 1923. This is where the Jews assert themselves the most. And the strongest in the center of power.

ZKK, which is at the center of power: the curve for the ZKK is the highest. . .

The changes in the structure of the party and state apparatus in the period of party struggles is finally marked by the creation of two new supreme organs of government. Since the 12th Party Congress, the following have been convened for joint meetings: 1. the Plenum of the Politburo and the Presidium of the CEC, and 2. the Plenum of the CEC. and the Presidium of the CEC. While the first special body met in special cases, the second became the normal institution, convened in each case after the united plenums of the CC. and the CCC.

If we now compile the Jewish share in all the de facto decisive organs of the power apparatus according to the status as of the 15th Party Congress, the following overview emerges The Jewish share amounted to in v. H.:

The highest proportion of Jews (31.3%) is in the Presidium of the Central Committee, followed by the

Politburo Plenum and the Central Committee Presidium, and then, at a small distance, the Central Committee Plenum and the Central Committee Presidium. In fourth place is the Central Committee, and last is the Politburo with 11.8%. Thus Jews are also most strongly represented in all the most important organs.

All in all, it emerges that in the highest organs of Bolshevik power elected after the destruction of the Trotskyists, the Jewish proportion was about one-fifth to almost one-third of the total.

The position of the Jews in power was by no means broken by the defeat of the opposition. On the contrary, the fact that the Jews entered the apparatus reformed by Stalin in large numbers from the outset enabled them to assert their position to an unrestricted degree in the very center of

Soviet power during the transition of the Soviet Union into the epoch of Stalin.

Chapter Three

Epoch of Stalin

(1928 to December 1935)

The party apparatus.

By early 1928, Stalin's domination of the party is undisputed. A new epoch in Soviet history begins. The changes in the structure of the party and state apparatus, which during the years 1923 to 1927 had been determined by the struggle for power, were now conditioned solely by the transition of the USSR to the quiet of full Marxism. The Five-Year Plan, centered on the figure of the dictator, dominates all changes in the state structure.

First of all, the CCC lost its position as the supreme organ of the party and the government, which had just been omnipotent, and the center of state power moved to another place. The reasons for this are as follows:

The crushing of the "oppositional bloc" at the 15th Party Congress freed Stalin from all his adversaries and opened up for him the possibility of realizing his plans for socialization. The resolution on turning the course to full Marxism was unanimously adopted by the Party Congress and its realization was started in the following spring of 1928.

If Stalin's victory over the representatives of the opposition was complete, this naturally did not prevent him from carrying out the Marxist and anti-peasant policy in which he basically agreed with the "opposition." Stalin differed from the doctrinaire opposition in that he regarded the "construction of socialism in one country" as the first step toward world revolution, but this very "socialist construction" was nothing other than the direct execution of the Marxist-Leninist program. Only unworldly theorists can consider Stalin's "socialism in one country" as a kind of "national socialism". In truth, Bolshevism, even of Stalin's type, is the sharpest antithesis of national socialism. Class struggle, annihilation of the peasantry, far-revolutionary aims and Jew domination are inherent in Stalinism from its beginning to the present day. All this is in the sharpest possible contradiction to the principles and ideas of a national socialism, not to mention the materialistic world view and the principled hostility to religion which underlie Stalinism as a logical form of Marxism.

Stalin, when he gained unrestricted domination, smoothly adopted the Trotskyists' radical demands for industrialization and socialization. The dispute over economic methods in 1924-1927, continuation of the NEP, reconstruction with loosening of the state fetters, or continuation of socialism, ended with the full victory of Marxist principles. The leaders of the opposition were crushingly defeated, but the Jewish-doctrinaire plans for socialization triumphed across the board - the ideas of Bolshevism, carried primarily by Jews, became determinative for the further development of Soviet Russia.

Stalin's socialism, from now on called "Stalinism," was fundamentally no different from the "socialism" of his opponents. There was only a tactical difference: his opponents wanted first the world revolution and then "socialist construction," while Stalin intended first "socialist construction" on the already

conquered territory and then, from this platform, the world revolution.

In the planning, management and implementation of the socialism now undertaken by Stalin, the decisive influence of the Jews asserts itself, since they had already penetrated the apparatus in large numbers in 1923 and had become predominant in the main nerve centers.

In the epoch of Stalin, it was industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture that determined the meaning and content of the life of the Union. But who was in charge of the preparatory work? In the field of agriculture it was the "International Agrarian Institute" in Moscow, as a department of the Communist Academy. The leading figures of the Institute – three Jews: Larin (Lurye), Krietzmann and Yakovlev (Epstein). The Presidium of the State Plan Commission in 1932 consisted of well over half Jews. Once again, Jews are the main culprits in bringing about measures whose constructive, anti-life nature has now led to a serious crisis in the Soviet economy. The fact of open famine and the death of millions²⁾ cannot be denied by any deceptive maneuvers.

A few months after the restoration of party unity at the 15th Party Congress, a new "right-wing aberration" emerged in the top party organs regarding the implementation of socialization plans into reality. Its leaders, Bukharin, Rykov, later Tomsy, Uglanov and others (all Russians), agreed with the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of the peasant economy, but they demanded a gradual transition to socialism and consideration for the peasantry. Since Stalin needed the support of the "Right" at the 15th Party Congress to defeat the Left Opposition, the resolution on the construction of socialism and the "Five-Year Plan of the National Economy" was drafted in very vague, general terms. Above all, it said nothing about the methods and pace of socialization, precisely what constituted the content of the Right's main demand. Stalin, however, was concerned above all with not committing himself by any precise and definite resolutions of the Party Congress. Rather, he wanted to obtain its agreement in principle to the construction of socialism, so that he could then carry out the plans that had been developed in his immediate environment.

Stalin and his closest entourage deceived the Right at the 15th Party Congress, which adopted the socialization plans. Not only was the final version of the five-year plan not presented to the delegates of the Party Congress, so that they were left in the dark about its pace and methods, but Stalin directly declared that socialism should be implemented in the cities at a slow pace and in the countryside by means of vision and conviction. The basis for the transition of the village to socialism should be, as Rykov demanded, the main mass of the peasant individual farms. Molotov also made a corresponding statement:

Molotov: ". . . It must not be forgotten that in the next few years our village economy will develop mainly as a mass of small peasant economies. The transition to a large, collectivized economy – that is a matter of a number of years. "3)

On the basis of these statements and the expression included in the resolution about the "gradual transition" to collectivization, the Right voted for its adoption. Also adopted was the resolution on a new law "On the Use and Establishment of Land". An outwardly harmless point of this law then in practice gave Stalin the handhold to carry out all desired measures for accelerated and complete collectivization and the possibility to force the decrease of individual farms even from those peasants who did not want to enter the collective.

When, as a result, a veritable war of extermination against the peasant began and the fraud was recognized, a tremendous storm arose in the ranks of the Right. They were joined by the broadest circles of the party (according to some accounts, the great majority of the Bolsheviks), who were inwardly opposed to the monstrous plans of socialist construction. At the April 1928 plenum of the CC and the CCC, Stalin encountered resistance for the first time from the apparatus that had hitherto been blindly devoted to him.⁵⁾ It emerged that the majority of the members of the CCC opposed Stalin, while the

majority of the Bolsheviks opposed him. Stalin, while most of the Central Committee was on his side. As a result, out of 195 members elected at the last Party Congress, 94, i.e. almost half, were expelled from the CCC at the next, the 16th Party Congress. Out of 22 members of the last Presidium, 9 were not re-elected, and 4 of them were expelled from the CCC altogether. Of 11 members of the Party College, 4 were not re-elected and 3 of them were thrown out of the CCC. altogether. Out of 10 candidates of the Presidium, only 5 were elected as members of the Presidium, the others were not re-elected as candidates and 4 of them were expelled from the ZKK. altogether. The disintegration of the CCC at the 16th Party Congress was complete. The united plenum of the CC. and the CCC. was convened less frequently since the April clash and the ruling center passed to the Central Committee. The CCC.'s push away from leadership in politics was also evident in the fact that numerous leading members of the CCC.'s Presidium were appointed to high Soviet posts. Since membership in the CEC precluded occupation of other posts, their appointment automatically eliminated them from the CEC, thereby reducing their importance. Appointment to state (soviet) posts meant preferential treatment for those concerned, because both the People's Commissariats and all the state agencies connected with them became the most important organs of state building in the Stalin era and gained exceptional importance.

Among the appointees, the high number of Jews stands out. Thus, of the members of the CCC. on Soviet posts were appointed

4. a. appointed: Rosenholtz to the People's Commissar for Foreign Trade; Gurevich and M. Kaganovich to the Presidium of the Supreme People's Economic Council; Semlyachka as head of the Control and Audit Administration at the People's Commissariat for Transport, and numerous others. We will discuss the appointments in detail in the next section.

If the plenum of the CC. and the CCC. also met in the last five years, it was only for the conviction of party members. The CCC. lost its character of a body for dealing with state issues, but retained the functions of a GPU. for the Communists and, together with the RKL, supervising the activity of the Soviet offices according to the orders of the Secretariat of the CC. of the Communist Party.

This controlling activity was further strengthened by the introduction at the 16th Party Congress (1950) of the delegation of representatives of the O G P U. to the CC. and the CCC. – evidence of the increase in the influence of the OGPU. on politics. The following were elected:6)

Menshinski (Pole), the chairman of the OGPU. as a member of the CC. (Re-elected); Jagoda (Jew), the first deputy chairman of the OGPU., as a candidate of the CC.

As members of the CC.: the second deputy chairman of the OGPU. Messing (Jude) and three members of the College of the OGPU. Thus, out of a total of 6 representatives of the OGPU. in the highest party bodies, 2 representatives or 33.3 per cent were Jews.

For the first time, the names of the representatives of the CCC. in the Politburo and O r g b ü r o are also published; at the same time, the number of representatives has also been increased – again proof of the increase in the influence of the party's control organs on politics. To the Politburo, instead of the previous 4 representatives – 9, and to the Orgburo, also instead of the previous 4 – 6 representatives of the Presidium of the CCC. are elected. Among the 9 representatives of the CCC in the Politburo, 5 or again 33.3% are Jews (Rosenholtz, Soljtz and Yaroslavsky). Two of the 6 representatives in the Orgbüro – again 33.3% – are Jews (Semlyachka and Roisenmann). Thus, of the ZKK. representatives elected to the highest party organs in 1930, one-third were Jews.

*

Let us examine on the basis of the following table the national composition of the Presidium of the ZKK.7)

National composition of the Central Control Commission of the CP.
(1950-1932)

Presidium

Party College

x) The composition of the Secretariat and the Party College (for 1932) not reported in "Pravda".

While the proportion of Russians, both in absolute terms and as a percentage, has been rising sharply continuously since 1927, the Jewish proportion has been falling. While in 1927 there were 7 Russians in the Presidium of the CCC, in 1932 there were 11, i.e. an increase of 57.2%. Conversely, the Jewish share decreased from 10 to 8 members of the Presidium, i.e. by 20%. The number of Russian candidates rose from 1 to 5, the number of Jewish candidates fell from 5 to 1. While in 1927 half of all candidates were Jews, in 1930 there was not a single Jew among the candidates. The ZKK had lost its exclusive position of power, and automatically the Jewish share fell.

Only in the Party Collegium, which retained its functions as the highest court for Communists in full measure, did the Jewish proportion also assert itself. An increase in the total number of members from 1930 to 1932 by 22% automatically corresponds to an increase in the Jewish share by 25%. In 1930, the Jewish share in the Partkolleg totaled 31.2%, while all other non-Russian foreign peoples together had to be content with a share of -6.3%.

The state apparatus.

Since the first years after the transformation of the Soviet Union into a fully socialist state, the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, which until now was only nominally the highest organ of the Republic, has become so in reality. This new position of the Sovnarkom resulted from the tremendous work in building industry and socializing agriculture.

The importance of the People's Commissars was initially increased by enlarging the SNK. by creating new commissariats and dividing existing ones. Apart from the technical necessity (the individual commissariats simply could not cope with the huge workload), this measure was based on the intention of Stalin and his entourage to tighten their grip on the country's government in view of the difficulties the SNK. encountered in its work. The same goal was pursued by the numerous appointments and removals in the People's Commissariats and their subsidiary offices that began in late 1929. The intention was to breed a "unified spirit" among both the people's commissars and the rest of the supreme state administration in the spirit of the times. This "unified spirit" now manifested itself in a growing predominance of the Jewish element. Increasingly, the Jews spread into the people's commissariats and the high state offices attached to them. The center of gravity of the Jewish element shifted to the state apparatus, which in the epoch of Stalin, together with the Central Committee, more precisely the Secretariat

Looking at these appointments in detail, one finds that most of the Jews were appointed to the People's Commissariats for Agriculture, for Foreign Trade and Supply, to the Foreign Commissariat and the various Industrial Commissariats, and finally, to a particularly sharp degree, to the State Plan Commission with its sub-commissions. So it is precisely in the most decisive areas - foreign policy, socialization of agriculture and industrialization - that the Jews are most strongly represented. Moreover, precisely where the supreme leader or his deputy is a Jew: if the leadership is Jewish, then in a short time the entire stock of officials in only semi-responsible posts is also Jewish. -

Special attention should be paid to the party rank of the people's commissars, which acquired its own meaning in the epoch of Stalin. In the last SNK elected under Lenin in 1922, among 19 People's Commissars only 4 were at the same time members of the Politburo and 3 members of the Central

Committee of the Communist Party. The transfer of high state offices to a relatively small number of top party leaders occurred because Lenin feared that influential and energetic party men entrusted with the office of People's Commissar would pursue policies contrary to those of the Politburo. Especially also because the most active element of the party in this epoch was in opposition to the ruling group. Approximately since 1924, since the formation of the first SNK. of the Union are introduced from the outset in its existence both members of the CC. and the Politburo. For in the epoch of Stalin the fear that the members of the Politburo appointed as People's Commissars were in opposition to the Politburo ceased to exist, because almost all of its members were still among Stalin's most devoted supporters. From about 1926 on, the Politburo's membership changed only to a very minor extent, and then remained almost completely unchanged after the expulsion of the "rightists". Thus, the more we approach 1931, the more the number of members of high party organs in the Council of People's Commissars increases.

In 1931, all the more influential members and candidates of the Politburo were also People's Commissars, with the most prestigious holding the most important posts. At the same time, as we pointed out above, the Jewish element among the People's Commissars was increasing extraordinarily. Even the SNK. elected on April 27, 1927, had the following membership: 51)

Rykov (Russian), chair, member of the Politburo;
Rudsutak (Latvian ?), Deputy Chairman, Politburo candidate;
Ordzhonikidze (Georgian), Deputy Chairman;
Zurjupa (Russian), Deputy Chairman;
Chicherin (Russian), Foreign Affairs;
Voroshilov (Russian), War and Navy, Politburo member;
Rudsutak (Latvian ?), transportation;
Smirnov (Russian), post and telegraph;
Ordzhonikidze (Georgian), RKL;
Schmidt (non-Russian), labor;
Mikoyan (Armenian), foreign and domestic trade;
Bryukhanov (Russian), finance;
Kuibyshev (Jew), WSNH chairman;
Osinski (Russian), chairman of the Central Statistical Department.

A total of 12, of whom: 7 Russians, 4 non-Jewish foreign-born and a single Jew.

In contrast, the membership of the Council of People's Commissars elected on April 5, 1951, already shows an entirely different composition.⁸²⁾

Chair: Molotov (Russian), member of the Politburo;
Deputy: Kuibyshev (Jew), Politburo member;
Andreyev (Russian), Politburo member;
Rudsutak (Latvian ?), Politburo member;
Chairman d. Gosplan; Kuibyshev (Jew), Politburo member;
People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs: Litvinov (Jew);
Vk. for War and Navy: Voroshilov (Russian), Politburo member;
Vk. for Foreign Trade: Rosenholz (Jew), a representative of the ZKK. in the Politburo;
Vk. for Transport: Rukhimovich (Jew), a member of the CEC.;
Vk. for Water Transportation: Janson (Latvian), a representative of the ZKK. in the Politburo;
Vk. for Post and Telegraph: Antipov (Russian), a member of the Central Committee;
Vk. of RKL: Andreyev (Russian), Politburo member;
WSNH Chair: Ordzhonikidze (Georgian). Politburo member;

Vk. for Agriculture: Yakovlev (Jew), member of the CC.;
Vk. for Supply: Mikoyan (Armenian), Politburo candidate;
Vk. for Labor: Zikhon (Jew), member of the CC...;
Vk. for Finance: Grinko (?).

Thus, only 2, Litvinov and Grinko did not belong to the highest party organs.

Of a total of 15 People's Commissars, 4 were Russians (26.6 per cent), 6 J u d e n (40 per cent) and 4 other non-Russians (26.6 per cent).

Also the People's Commissars of the three independent People's Commissariats for Heavy, Light and Woodworking Industries, newly created in 1952 - members of the CC; the new head of the Central Administration of Agricultural Accounting - a member of the CC; the People's Commissar of the People's Commissariat for the Administration of Sovkhozes and State Livestock, newly created in October 1932 - a candidate of the CC; the leadership of the Fulfillment Commission consists of two members of the Politburo, a secretary of the CC..., one member and one candidate of the CC.; the chairmen of the committees at the STO. - All members of the Politburo. Conversely, of 10 members of the Politburo in 1932, seven simultaneously held highest Soviet offices. Only three, who headed the main party organizations, the Moscow, Leningrad, and Ukrainian Communist Parties, did not hold Soviet posts.

The fusion of the top party apparatus with the top Soviet (state) apparatus in the epoch of Stalin had the following significance:

The difficulty of the questions of state building that arose and had to be decided in the epoch of Stalin had of itself to bring persons with expertise to the fore and to push back the pure politicians. The former were the People's Commissars, the latter the members of the Central Committee under the leadership of Stalin, the General Secretary of the Party. As a result of the two sides' failure to understand each other, conflicts could and did arise, and the more mutual understanding dwindled, the sharper they became. However, in the combination of politics with experience and knowledge into a coherent whole, there is the problem of power.

Stalin realized that the tremendous new work would put the SNK. in the lead and the politicians, i.e. the members of the CC. and Stalin's support, in the rear. The People's Commissars would thus play the leading political role, and the CC. and thus Stalin himself would be relegated to second place. To counter this, members of the highest party organs were appointed People's Commissars, and at the same time Stalin carried out a far-reaching reform of the CC. secretariat in 1950. The essence of this reform was "differentiation according to functional characteristics", i.e. the immediate supreme direction and supervision of the course of socialization was transferred to the Secretariat. This allowed the Secretariat to take directly all necessary measures to strengthen the work of building industry and collectivizing agriculture. For this purpose, the Secretariat was divided into a number of departments whose work encompassed the entire economic, governmental and cultural life of the Union. The work of the People's Commissariats, both in the field of industrialization and in the socialization of agriculture, was thus placed under the direct control of the Secretariat. Stalin "transformed the CC. of the Communist Party, or more correctly the Secretariat of the CC. into the lever that set the whole complicated state machine in motion." 53)

Thanks to this reform, Stalin was able, through his apparatus, to orient himself in all economic questions and, if necessary, to counter the indications of the People's Commissars. With the help of the compliant CCC, which had its eyes everywhere, and the authority of the CCC, Stalin himself became the center of the entire economic activity of the USSR. The intertwining of the CC with the state apparatus soon became evident. Since 1931, all the main regulations and laws appeared with the signature of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, Molotov, and the Secretary of the CC.

of the Communist Party, Stalin. This meant the establishment of a new supreme government body: the Plenum of the CC. and the Council of People's Commissars.

Let us also note here the proportion of Jews. For the year 1931 we have the following overview:

So also in the newly created center of power of the present epoch the share of the Jews amounts to more than one fifth of the total number.

Finally, in the epoch of Stalin the structure of the state apparatus is characterized by another important reorganization in the administration. Unified sessions of the Council of People's Commissars and the STO were established. For the year 1931, the Jewish share in this body is as follows:

The same picture: also in this important organ of the era of the Five-Year Plan the Jews form more than one third of the total number. –

Who now belongs to Stalin's closest entourage? Who are the supreme leaders in the Soviet Union? The last, 17th party conference (January/February 1932) gives an answer to this question. During the reading out of the persons proposed to the Presidium, the delegates received the following names with applause: Kagano-Vich (Jew), Kozior (Pole), Ordzhonikidze (Georgian) – applause, Molotov (Russian) – sustained applause, and Stalin – stormy applause, ovation of the whole hall. This is the main group! Among the other members of the Politburo, no one, not even Kalinin nor Voroshilov was worthy of applause.

Among the 5 first of the Soviet Union there is one – Jew, and this is the ruler of the Politburo!⁵⁴)
The regrouping.

We now interrupt the study of the share of Jews in the Bolshevik leadership and turn to the process of social regrouping of the Jews. For only from the position of the Jews in the leadership of the supreme party and state apparatus and from the results of the regroupment can an overview of the present role of the Jews in Soviet Russia be gained.

As we pointed out above⁵⁵), already under Lenin the first preparatory work was begun to transfer the mass of Jewish commercial and artisan existences, which were declassified under Soviet law, into the ranks of the working people. Thanks to the activity of the Komzet⁵⁶) founded in 1924 and other Jewish organizations that took in hand the land settlement and resettlement of the Jews, the social structure of the Jewish population began to change. The young Jews, some of whom could not find a sufficient income in trade and crafts, turned to other professions. They become employees, they penetrate into the intellectual professions, or go to the factory and to the country. Gradually a new type of Russian Jew was formed, clearly different from that of the pre-revolutionary period. Since the educational institutions are open to Jews as well as to Russians and Ukrainians, the Jewish educated proletariat, whose occupation before the revolution was exclusively revolutionary propaganda and agitation, is gradually dying out. Large numbers of Jewish children are receiving modern schooling, and the pre-revolutionary antagonisms between assimilated intellectuals and faith-faithful small merchants are fading. Where the Jews remain in close proximity to one another, the Jewish population gradually shows more uniform traits.

The following overview shows the results of the regrouping after the first Bolshevik census of December 1926.⁵⁷) There were under 100 Jews of the Soviet Union employed as:

The stratum of merchants and "others"⁵⁸ (liberal and indeterminate professions) has decreased the most, slightly more than by half (55.5 per cent), as a result of the abolition of private enterprise. The number of homeworkers has also fallen, but only by 9.6%. The number of blue-collar workers, on the other hand, has increased by 29.3%, and the number of farmers and white-collar workers has risen particularly sharply. The former increased almost fourfold and the latter almost threefold. In total, the number of working Jews (workers, employees and peasants together), which was 27.2% before the revolution, increased by 100% to 55.4%. In order to emphasize the successes of the revolution, the Soviet Jewish side

points with particular emphasis to this regrouping, this increase of the working people under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

However, a closer look reveals that nothing has changed in the internal, actual structure of the Jewish population. Even after the revolution, the Jews prefer almost exclusively intellectual professions and light physical labor (light handicrafts). If we compile the values from the above table accordingly, we see the following. There were under 100 Jews employed as:

Intellectual occupations have increased the most, by almost 60 per cent, followed by laborers and farmers, which have increased by 55 per cent. In the relative increase of this class, the Jewish colonists have the largest share. It must not be forgotten that the land settlers are masses who represent only a vanishing fraction compared to the total Jewish population. Thus a shift has occurred within the individual strata, but the preference for intellectual activity and light manual labor has not changed fundamentally. Almost three quarters of all Jewish workers – 71 percent to be exact – are neither laborers nor farmers. Since before the Revolution the figure was 82%, the number of those engaged in intellectual activities and light manual labor has decreased by only 13.4%.

Even the settlement of Jews in the countryside, which was carried out on the broadest basis, did not change the basic social character. Altogether, according to the 1926 census, 92 per cent of all Jewish workers are non-agricultural, while of the entire population of the Union in that year only 18.8 per cent were urban. Thus, the social structure of the Jewish population is still exactly the opposite of that of their surroundings. In this fact, in the sharp differentiation from their surroundings that persists in spite of revolution and regroupment, in this failure to fit into the proletarian labor character of Soviet Russia, lies the first reason for today's hostility toward Jews. As Heller also admits, the easier work of the Jews, their higher income and the greater influence of a minority, apart from the generally growing national feeling in Soviet Russia, result in the first starting points of today's anti-Semitism. The Soviet government is therefore primarily concerned with bringing the Jews into line with the rest of the population in terms of their social stratification. At first, however, the Jews predominated by far in the professions mentioned and thus challenged the justified displeasure of the natives.

In December 1929 the Jewish population of the Soviet Union now showed the following structure:⁰⁸ Unfortunately, the statistics are not divided into workers and employees. However, if one assumes, according to the census of 1926, that of the workers and salaried employees together 40 per cent are workers and 60 per cent salaried employees, then for the above list it results: 12.3 per cent workers and 18.5 per cent salaried employees. In total, $38.4 + 18.5 = 56.9$ percent were employed in intellectual occupations and in light manual labor (1926: 59 percent). If one adds the merchants and the liberal professions, then in 1929, the twelfth year of the proletarian dictatorship, a total of 80 percent of the Jewish population were neither workers nor farmers. Since the corresponding figure for 1926 was 71.5 percent, the number of those employed in intellectual occupations and in light crafts increased even more. Even the modest proportion of 7.7 per cent employed in agriculture (8 per cent in 1926) does not speak well for the success of the Bolshevik attempts to transform Jewish merchants and intellectuals into peasants.

The preference for the big cities has also remained exactly the same: the influx to Moscow has been enormous. (We recall here the mass migration of Jews to the center at the beginning of the Revolution). According to Larin's data, the following movement took place in Moscow:⁶⁰

Thus, while the non-Jewish population of Moscow increased by 50.5 per cent during this period, the Jewish population increased by 364 per cent (three hundred and sixty-four). Even among the working class, this migration of peoples caused a tremendous stir.

In Moscow, therefore, the penetration of Jews into the intellectual professions, especially into the state workforce, has been extraordinarily strong. According to the 1926 census, of all Jews in the Union, 28

per cent were white-collar workers (with family members and the unemployed); in Moscow this ratio is more than doubled. The proportion of Jewish white-collar workers among the total Jewish population of the Union, compared with the distribution of Jews among the individual areas in 1926, was as follows:61)

Thus, if 59 per cent of all the Jews of the Soviet Union, i.e. far more than half, live in the Ukraine, the percentage of salaried employees among the total Jewish population – 28 per cent – is undercut there. In Ukraine, for every 100 Jews there are only 24² employees. In Moscow it is just the opposite: there live only 5% of all Jews of the Union, but they deviate in their social structure from the Union average completely – in Moscow 60.6 of 100 Jews are employees. Among the self-employed without families, the figure is as high as 62.6.

During the heyday of the NEP, with the private economy partially restored, the mass of Jews turned back to trade and hand work. The Jews were among the most prominent representatives of a new bourgeoisie. According to a 1925 census, the urban petty, middle and big bourgeoisie of the USSR included about 5 million people, or 20 percent of the total urban population of the Union. Of these 5 million, 940,000 or 18.8% belonged to the Jewish bourgeoisie.62)

Regarding the share of Jews in the total workforce of Ukraine and Belarus, where a total of almost % of all Jews of the USSR live, the following should be noted. There, the proportion of Jewish employees among the total workforce is approximately equal to or even exceeds the proportion of Jews in the total urban population. Since the Jews, as a result of their urban character, have a very high percentage among the total urban population – 20 to 40 percent63) – the percentage of Jews among the total workforce is accordingly extraordinarily high. According to a census of October 1, 1929, the figures were as follows:84)

Thus, the percentage of Jews among all state employees in Ukraine is more than 3 times their share of the population, and in Belarus almost 8 times. Unlike Ukraine, where German, National Ukrainian, Red and White governments took turns, Belarus has never been cut off from the center of the revolution. Here the development of Bolshevism has not been hindered, and here the proportion of Jews among state employees is the largest.

In 1928 the Jewish proportion in the "apparatus of public organizations" (elected and appointed heads of trade unions, governorate departments of federations, party committees, etc.) of the Union (!) was 19 per cent.88) An extraordinarily high figure, because in it is expressed the Jewish proportion in the total number of all leading officials of the Union It is over 10 times greater than the population ratio of Jews and even more than 2 times greater than the proportion of Jews in the total urban population of the Union (8.3 per cent). Thus, this enormous proportion of Jews in the leadership of the entire public apparatus cannot be explained by their urban character alone, but is a consequence of the systematic pushing of Jews into the leadership.

The following overview provides an extremely characteristic example of how the proportion of Jews systematically increases with the rank of the administrative bodies. The proportion of Jews in the Soviets and Executive Committees of Ukraine and Belarus was in v. H.:M)

Table see page 131

The table clearly shows how the proportion of Jews systematically increases from the lower to the higher levels of administration, finally reaching its highest level in the highest Soviet bodies.

Moreover, the Jewish proportion in all administrative bodies, both in the Ukraine and in Belarus, is greater in 1929 than in 1927 – proof of the ever-increasing penetration of the Jews into the state administration.

In the Red Army, too, the same picture.

Throughout, the Jews are more strongly represented in the leadership than in the crew. According to the census of October 1, 1929, of the squad 1.8 per cent were Jews and of the command staff – 4.4 per cent.⁶⁷) If one examines the representation of Jews in the command staff individually, their intrusion into the leadership becomes even clearer. There were Jews:⁸⁸)

Political Commissars

(now: heads of political work) . . 10.3 per cent.

Actual command staff 2.1 " "

Administration 3.9 " "

Medical staff 18.6 " "

Veterinary personnel 4.5 " "

Command staff of war schools ... 3.5 " "

Lower command staff 1.5 " "

The Jews are most strongly represented among the medical personnel, second strongest in the political management and weakest in the lower command staff.

According to another census of January 1, 1929, this stronger penetration of the Jews into the upper command posts is particularly clearly expressed in direct contrast to the distribution of the natives. The following were represented in the command of the Red Army in v. H. :⁸⁸)

The higher the rank, the lower the proportion among Ukrainians and White Russians. The share of Russians in the highest command is also somewhat lower than in the older ones. Exactly the opposite is true for the Jews: they are most strongly represented in the highest command rank.

*

Let us now consider the movement of the Jewish share in the total membership of the Communist Party.

From 5.2 per cent in 1922 it fell to 4.33 per cent in 1927 and to 3.8 per cent in 1930.⁷⁰) This does not mean, however, that the influx of Jews into the party has weakened; on the contrary, from 1922 onward the total number of party members has been growing somewhat faster and more strongly than the Jewish proportion. While the total number of members increased by 96 per cent from 1922 to 1927,⁷¹) the number of Jewish members increased by 92.9 per cent.⁷²) This advance of the total pace over the Jewish increase arises from the fact that it is only after the end of the civil wars that the Ukrainians and the other larger non-Jewish nations enter the party in greater numbers. And since the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians, next to the Russians, have the largest share in the total population of the Soviet Union (21.27 and 3.23 per cent, respectively, as against 1.77 per cent of the Jews), their increase now mainly determines the growth of the party as a whole. And this increase is about three times greater than the increase of Jewish Communists. If the Jewish members of the party increased by 92.9% from 1922 to 1927, the number of Ukrainians increased by 276.9%, of Belarusians by 348% and of some Caucasian peoples even by 400–500%.⁷³) In other words, the Bolshevization among the Jews had already reached an enormous lead in 1922.

which the other nations are only now beginning to catch up with.⁷⁴)

After 1922, the pace of Jewish influx into the party is surpassed by the other nationalities. But still, according to the party census of January 10, 1927, the Jewish lead is not even close to being caught up by the Russians, nor by the Ukrainians and White Russians. The following table characterizes these proportions:

As can be seen, already in 1922 the Jews are almost three times more represented in the party than corresponds to their population ratio. The Russians only by a little more than one third and the Ukrainians and White Russians about 3.5 and two times weaker respectively.⁷⁹) In 1927 communism is twice as widespread among the Jews as among the Russians, two and a half times more widespread than

among the White Russians, and four and a half times more widespread than among the Ukrainians! Altogether, in 1927, for every 10,000 persons of non-Jewish population of the Union there were 100 Communists, and for every 10,000 Jews – 190.80)

So much for the movement of the Jewish proportion in the party as a whole. In the more important party organizations and among the delegates to party congresses, Jews are already more than twice as numerous as in the party as a whole. If in the Union average of 1927 4.54 per cent of the total party were Jews, in the Moscow party committee in 1926 among 153 persons there were 17 Jews or 11 per cent.81)

Among the delegates to the 16th Congress of the CP in July 1930, 57.5 percent were Russians and 10 percent were Jews. For all other nations together, only a little over 30 per cent remained.82)

Communism is also remarkably widespread among the female Jewish population. According to the party census of January 10, 1927, Jewish women ranked first among all nations with 23.0% of all Jewish party members. They were followed by Latvian women with 18.1%, then Finnish, Estonian and Polish women, and finally, in sixth place, Russian women with 11.3% of all Russian party members.88)

Certainly, this high proportion of Jewish women in the party influenced the outcome of numerous marriages of leading Russian Communists to Jewish women.

The proportion of Jews in the Komsomol (Communist Youth League) almost equaled their proportion in the party. The slowly increasing spread of Communism among the youth of the other nations has resulted in a decline, albeit a disappearing one, in the Jewish proportion here as well. Overall, the Jewish share has declined from 4.6 per cent in 1925 to 4.08 per cent on October 1, 1929.84) In the individual areas heavily populated by Jews, the Jewish share is, of course, significantly higher and exceeds their population ratio there by a factor of two to three. According to the October 1925 census, 13.2% of Komsomol members in Ukraine were Jews, and 24.1% in Belarus.86) (Population ratio in Ukraine: 5.4%, and in Belarus: 8.2%).

Membership in the Komsomol is also considerably greater among Jewish girls than among Russian girls. After the Buryat and Finnish girls, the Jewish girls are in third place with 36% of all Jewish members of the Komsomol. They are followed in fourth place by Russian girls with only 24 per cent of all Russian Komsomol members.86)

We note the same stronger participation of the Jews in the professional associations. The Jews, who are more united, make much more use of the existing organizations than do the natives.

more than the natives in order to secure for themselves a decisive influence.

According to "Westnik Truda" were:87)

The Jews are thus consistently organized in the professional associations by more than double compared to the total population

Equally indicative of the Jews' urge to secure a strong position for themselves outside of purely political leadership is their share in the "Kampfverband der Gottlosen". Here, moreover, Jewish radicalism and the exploitation of an organization solely for its own advantage are expressed in particularly stark terms. In the following we give an account of Prof. Berg: ")

At first the "Kampfverband" had led the fight against all religions except the Mosaic one. As late as in the autumn of 1928 a protest of 60,000 believing Moscow Jews was successful against the decision of the Moscow Soviet to convert the Moscow Main Choral Synagogue into a Communist club. In 1929, however, on the occasion of the Jewish New Year celebration, the Moscow Jewish organization was dissolved by the GPU. and all the leaders of the Jewish religious movement were put on trial for religious propaganda. The occasion was as follows:

When, at the beginning of October 1929, the Association of the Godless announced its new guidelines for the Christmas campaign against the Christian Church, the population demanded the same cult

reprisals against the Jews as well. Under the pressure of popular sentiment, a resolution to this effect had to be passed at a secret board meeting of the Association. Thereupon, the Jewish board members and propaganda chiefs, who formed the bulk of the Federation's leadership, left the conference in great agitation.

When the Mosaic population of Moscow gathered in large numbers in their synagogues on Jewish New Year's Day, public rallies of the citizens took place. The masses shouted: "We demand equal rights for all! The Jews who have agitated and are still agitating against our religion shall now be agitated by us." This action prompted the GPU. to close the synagogue, dissolve the Jewish organizations and arrest their leaders.

These events are a clear reflection of the national composition of the leadership and members of the Union of the Godless. At the top are the Jews Yaroslavsky, Scheinmann, Lukachevsky. According to the communications of the Central Association, in 1929 the Association had about 3 million members. The following nations are most strongly represented:2)

The fighting measures of the federation are characterized by harshness and ruthlessness. In 1931 the demand was made that all churches be closed by January 1, 1934. There was also an intention to move the headquarters from Moscow to Berlin for the sake of greater impact of the movement.91)

*

Concerning land settlement, the measure for the regrouping of the Jews which the Soviet government put in the foreground, we note here the following. The project of the Soviet government to give a new existence to a part of the inhabitants of the Jewish town, which was in the process of dissolution, by means of colonization, has received widespread support from domestic and foreign Jews. To support the "Komzet", the government organ for colonization, another social organization, the "Society for the Land Settlement of Working Jews" ("Ozet"), was founded. Its task was propaganda for Jewish land settlement among the population of the Soviet Union, fund raising, etc.

Among foreign Jews, relief organizations sprang up everywhere, donating significant sums. Thus in the United States, France, Germany ("Ort" Association in Berlin), Austria, Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden. Outside Europe, besides North America, in Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, South Africa and even in Australia among Jewish immigrants coming from Russia. The most important organization was the "Agrojoint" in North America.

It is noteworthy that the Soviet government pursued foreign policy goals with Jewish colonization at the same time. The settlement work in southern Russia was to become a rival enterprise for British-sponsored Zionism and Palestine settlement. This meant an attack on the prestige of English cultural policy. As early as 1920, in a resolution on the authoritative principles of Soviet nationality policy, Palestine was held up as an example of the popular deception of the Jews by England and called for a struggle against Zionism.92)

On the other hand, Jewish financial circles in the United States were to be interested in the settlement of the Crimea in order to achieve recognition by America through their influence on American policy.93)

This certainly very clever move of Bolshevik policy is not contradicted by the Bolshevik-Jewish side. However, an attempt is made to clothe the interest of Jewish bankers in America for Soviet colonization in a national garb. Thus Larin, quoting at length several English, American and Russian (émigré) press voices pointing to the connections marked above, says that the American Jewish bankers Marshai, Warburg, Rosenwald and others support Jewish colonization in the Soviet Union "mainly for national and similar reasons."®4)

In fact, World Jewry has a very real interest in Jewish land settlement. If it supports colonization, it strengthens the position of the Jews in the Soviet Union even more. World Jewry thus becomes even more interested in the existence of the Soviet government, which is under predominant Jewish influence

and which, moreover, promotes Jewish colonization to the greatest possible extent by providing land and means. In the event of a threat to Soviet power, the Jewish colonists are then considered hostages. At the beginning of 1931, about 260,000 Jewish people (of whom about 201,000 belong to the post-revolutionary colonization) were employed in agriculture. Assuming a total Jewish population for 1931 of 2.75 million, about 9.5 percent were thus employed in agriculture. Thus, even this action could not change the predominantly urban character of the Jews. Moreover, after the recognition by America, the interest of the Soviet government in Jewish colonization declined.

Through the colonization, the recognition of the Jews in the Soviet Union as a national minority and the strong development of the Jewish national culture, the national feeling of the Jews grew significantly. Eventually, the desire for autonomy arose. However, according to Soviet law, autonomy is inseparable from territory. According to the decision of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR, dated March 28, 1928, such a territory has now been provided in Birobidjan, in Eastern Siberia on the Amur River, and the promise has been made to create an autonomous Jewish administrative unit "in case of favorable results of the closed settlement of the Birobidjan rayon". The granting of autonomy is connected, among other things, with the right to grant citizenship of the USSR, to immigrants.

The hopes for the settlement of Birobidjan have not yet been realized, despite the most sacrificial work of young Jews. The percentage of return migration was even very high in the beginning – 29 to 52% –, in 1930 it had improved somewhat, but still amounted to 23%. According to the plan, 40,000 Jewish colonists were to be settled. However, after a four-year colonization period, by March 1932 a total of only 6000 Jewish settlers had settled in Birobidjan under their own administration.*6) In the summer of 1932, another 300 Jewish families arrived from France, Germany and America. The climate is not unfavorable, but the land is covered with large virgin forests and presents great difficulties for development. Despite abundant American aid money and very diligent work by the colonists, who undoubtedly lived under very difficult conditions, the colony, as mentioned, developed very slowly. Even the reports of Jewish colonists from the spring of 1933 do not contain any reports of major progress. Given the dominant position of the Jews in Russia, there is also no compelling reason to build up a "state" of one's own in the Siberian jungle under the hardest labor.

*

Our study of the occupational reorganization of the Jewish population and the dynamics of the Jews in the organizations of the masses has shown us that nothing essential has changed in the social structure of Russian Jewry, let alone in their behavior. In the Soviet Union the Jews have all freedom of acquisition and learning, and they are even conspicuously favored in many fields. Whereas formerly the position under exceptional laws and social and national oppression had helped to determine the occupational stratification of the Jews, the picture of the Jews in the Soviet Union today emerges as the result of a free and completely uninhibited development. Not only does this image not show any change, but on the contrary, all the traits peculiar to Judaism for millennia emerge in a particularly sharp character. As before, the Jews prefer trade, intellectual professions and lighter physical work. As before, the Jews force their way into the administration to a particularly large extent at the expense of the natives, and as before, the greater the powers of the administrative body in question, the greater is their share. In the top echelons of the party and state apparatus the Jews are still 5 to 15% more strongly represented than in the party mass, and 10 to 20, indeed over 30% more strongly than corresponds to their population ratio! The impulse of the Jews to adapt themselves to the environment and to "gain a strong position in it" has not been diminished by any shock, however great. It has proved its indestructible power in all revolutionary epochs of the Soviet history.

However, due to the penetration of the Jews into all professions, the knowledge of this very Jewish

essence has penetrated into all strata of the population. The consequence was - anti-Semitism. By the transformation of the Jewish town hundreds of thousands were transferred into the ranks of the working people. In the countryside appeared the Jewish colonists and in the factories the Jewish workers. Offices swarmed with Jewish employees, and educational institutions filled with Jewish pupils and students. If one considers that in the years 1925 to 1929 in Soviet Russia 3 million workers and employees were newly employed in the production process, one realizes to what extent the areas of friction between Jews and non-Jews increased. Many bring dim memories of the Jewish merchant and mediator between village and city, but many others are catching sight of the Jew for the first time. Thus the knowledge of the Jew penetrates into strata that never saw the Jew before, and the former anti-Semitism gets new nourishment.

It is significant - also for the attitude of the party - that during the fights against the Trotskyists one again heard the word "Shid" (Jud) in the streets, without being immediately seized by the GPU. as before. In 1928/29 it is 1t. Newspaper reports frequent anti-Semitic riots occurred, which sometimes almost took on the character of pogroms. A small number of them were brought before the courts, and it always turned out that the crimes were committed in the presence and with the tacit or loud acquiescence not only of the working class, but also of the party, trade union and factory organizations. This confirms the breadth of the anti-Semitic attitude of the population. In several trials, the participation of party members, especially young communists, was also noted. Seibert cites a telling figure: in the shafts of the Bokovo-Chrustaljski mining district, between February 15, 1920 and November 20, 1928, 2987 Jews were employed, not a single one of whom was able to stay, although among them were experienced miners.⁰⁶⁾

Contrary to the frequent attempts from the Jewish side to deny anti-Semitism or to put forward as its source former police agents, members of the former ruling classes and white-guard organizations, Larin clearly states,

"the presence of anti-Semitism at the beginning of 1929 among the workers of the USSR, is not doubted by anyone. "⁶⁷⁾

Popular sentiment has to some extent even found its way into judicial bodies, insofar as they are not under predominant Jewish influence. Expressions of opposition to the Jews are no longer punished by shooting, as they were under Lenin, but imprisonment, dismissals and reprimands are the usual punishments. In contrast, leading Soviet circles, especially Jewish ones, and the Bolshevik press, which is entirely under Jewish influence, repeatedly call for harsher punishment. For example, Larin reports that for a pogrom in a Jew's apartment involving beating, breaking dishes, and smashing doors and windows, the culprits were punished with 6 months of hard labor. Larin finds this punishment far too light. Also in another, milder case, which found its expiation with a reprimand with dismissal of the culprit (a party man) from his post, Larin calls the sentence "that's all."

According to newspaper news of recent years, cases of anti-Semitism in general are increasing, with the Komsomol and professional organizations being particularly prominent. In the factories, Jewish workers are insulted and mistreated by the other workers, and consequently cannot hold their own. In most cases, the factory management pretends not to see anything, or it presents such cases as simple labor disputes and remarks, in response to the factory committee's complaint, that the fight against anti-Semitism is not a matter for the factory management, but for the factory committee.

Particularly characteristic of the general

deep hatred against the Jews is the following case: in 1931, in the Jewish collective farm of the Mirsachiul district, a residential building for 80 families was being built. In order to obtain them, the executive committee of the district sent the leaders of the kolkhoz to the village soviet of Syr-Darya. To which the chairman of the village Soviet replied: "We give building material to the other kolkhozes, but

to your kolkhoz, especially yours, the Jewish one, we don't give any." w)

The source of anti-Semitism is always the peculiarity of the Jewish being. Easier work, higher income, dominating influence of a minority, preference for the tribesmen, displacement and disadvantage of the natives, conceit and arrogance and contempt for everything non-Jewish. In Moscow, the mass of Jewish immigrants challenges the discontent of the population. The additional constriction and deterioration of the catastrophic housing conditions caused particular bitterness. The population felt cramped and pushed back. They say: "There are too many Jews in Moscow".

The Jews stand out as the most outstanding representatives of a new bourgeoisie. And this bourgeoisie is even favored, as Larin reports. Thus, at Easter 1929, from the Königsberg Trade Mission of the USSR, for the Jewish religious community of Moscow, matzos were introduced and distributed free of charge among the Jewish faithful. This happened at the same time that special food books restricting the consumption of bread and flour were introduced.⁹⁸) It also happened at the same time that the Bolsheviks moved to intensify the fight against religion. Thus, at Easter 1929, all the theaters in Moscow were ordered to play in the morning and evening on Resurrection Night and the 1st holiday in order to keep the faithful from attending church. When the Moscow State Opera tried to sabotage this decision by playing down particularly short pieces especially quickly, the Bolshevik press raised a wild hue and cry and demanded punishment of the culprits.¹⁰⁰)

The preferential treatment of Jewish colonists also caused great discontent. "No other people of Russia," writes Seibert, "have been assigned such extensive and well-appointed land sites as the Jewish peasants on the Crimean peninsula." Moreover, mostly land of German peasants (!) has been used for the Jewish settlements.¹⁰¹) Thus, it was a natural phenomenon that in 1928/29, at the beginning of the great land settlement of the Jews, questions were asked at public meetings about the Jews. The questions were typical of the feeling of disadvantage and oppression among the locals. Thus, Lunacharsky was asked at a meeting in Moscow in 1929:¹⁰²)

"Comrade Lunacharsky, tell me, why are Jews given good soil in the Crimea, where nature itself gives such a great harvest, and why are they not given empty places, places in Siberia or in the Arkhangelsk Governorate, and why are Russians not sent to the Crimea? Or: Comrade* Lunacharsky, why did the Jews actually run away from Palestine? Why do they wander all over Europe? Why don't they do any sensible business at home?"

Following these questions, the Jewish writer O. Heller claims that their authors came exclusively from kulak circles and those close to the kulaks. This untrue assertion is followed by a second one, which marks the outrageous presumption of the Jewish being:¹⁰³)

"The liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the victory of the collectivization movement have understandably put an end to this questioning (!) as well." (Blocking H. F.)

This "questioning" was by no means limited to kulak circles, but the whole population asked. Thus, Lari, the high Jewish Soviet economist already mentioned several times, reports on 66 questions submitted to him in August 1928 before his lecture on anti-Semitism in one of the rayon committees of the party in Moscow.¹⁰⁴) Workers, members and candidates of the party and sympathizers were present at the meeting. The authors of the questions came exclusively from workers' circles, with Larin emphasizing that alongside the primitive questions of the person who had just come from the village were the more deeply probing questions of the enlightened quality worker. Here are some examples:

"Why are the Jews rich, have their bakers, their butchers, etc.?"

Why do the Jews who have arrived from Berdichev and other cities immediately get apartments? There is even a joke that from Berdichev the last Jew arrived and gave the keys to Kalinin.

Why aren't the Jews lining up?

Why do the Jews follow one after the other in work and service and accommodate them? This is not the

case with the Russians.

What share do the Jews have in the Communist Party in all countries?

Why does anti-Semitism arise only against the Jews and not against the other nations? The causes of anti-Semitism should be sought in the nation itself, in its psychological and moral education. (Blocking H. F.)

Why was 75 percent of the party opposition made up of Jews?

Why are there so few Jews on the labor exchange?

Why do the Jews not engage in heavy labor?

Why has the government not taken any measure against the entry of the Jewish bourgeoisie into Moscow?"

These questions, mind you, from party circles and circles close to the party, show that the workers are most severely disadvantaged by the Jews in the satisfaction of their most primitive necessities of life, such as housing, food, work. They also show that the people, in their instinctive certainty, have recognized that their "psychological and moral education" is to blame for their inferior position vis-à-vis the Jews.

The anti-Semitic movement in the Soviet Union is growing with each passing year. In the illegal literature the "incredible spread" of anti-Semitism has found clear expression.¹⁰⁵) Domestic and foreign observers unanimously confirm that an upheaval in the Soviet Union will inevitably be accompanied by the most terrible consequences for the Jews.

Foreign domination of Russia.

Our previous remarks have shown us that the Jews, who came to power in Russia as a result of the two revolutions of 1917, have not only maintained this position to an unlimited extent in the course of the 16 years of Soviet history, but have also extended it to all spheres of public life. Today the Jewish position of power exists in all spheres of political, economic and cultural life. The new culture promoted in Soviet Russia alone is under primarily Jewish influence, and its bearers emerge from Jewish strata.

Russian national culture is suppressed; only Jewish intellectual products are awarded prizes, promoted and sung about. In this predominance of Judaism in the entire life of the Union lies today the emphasis of the Jewish question. To characterize the present situation, we take the following details from an essay by S. Dmitriewski, the well-known former executive director of the Foreign Commissariat:¹⁰⁶)

We begin with a small but significant incident. In "Pravda" of May 29, 1933, there are verses by Demyan Bednyi, the Bolshevik court poet, who sings an enthusiastic hymn of praise to the "young participants of an all-federation contest of musicians." The poem praises the "childish triumph" as a counter to the "enemy slander" and concludes with the significant phrase: "Bloom, Soviet culture! Grow, dear child crowd."

These verses are dedicated to the promotion of young musical talent. Here it is about things of art, culture, it is children, it is the future of the country! And that's what it is: the future of the country! The full meaning of Demjan's verses emerges from their connection with the following provision of the Sownarkom on the awarding of the winners of this musical competition:

"By recognizing the outstanding musical-artistic talents of the following young musicians: Bus ja Goldstein (class of Prof. Jampolski), A. Kaplan (class of Prof. Goldenweiser), Beba Pritykina (class of Prof. Magasiner), Lisa Hillels (class of Prof. Stoljarski), Mischa Fichtenholz (class of Prof. Stoljarski) - each of them will receive a premium of 3000 rubles, and Samuel Hillels (class of Prof. Reinbald) a premium of 4000 rubles."

Among 165 million total population of the Soviet Union there are not yet 5 million Jews. However, in a national musical competition, only Jews are awarded prizes. This is the "Soviet culture" sung about by Demyan.

What about the other areas? The grandiose Palace of the Soviets, which is to determine the "face of Moscow's architecture," is built by the Jew Jonathan. The government supervisor during the construction – the Jew Krassin. The enormous Kuznetskstroï is built by the Jew Frankfurt. The huge tractor plant in Chelyabinsk, put into operation on June 1, 1933, with an annual output of 40,000 crawler tractors – the Jew Kogan. Among the young actresses was awarded as "meritorious" the Jewess Mansurova. To show the world the famous Russian ballet, abroad were sent not Kudryavtsev and Podgoretskaya, but Asath and Sulamith Messerer. Likewise, abroad saw only Jewish theater directors – Meyerhold, Tairov. Krassin, Aleksandrov, etc. This is the counteraction to the "enemy slander"! In "Pravda" and "Izvestia" of this year among the authors of the articles the most frequent names are Jewish: Radek, Kossil, Ilya Ehrenburg, Lifshitz, Zikhon, Zinoviev, Abramov, Bragin, Luria, Bergstein, etc. In the Academy of Sciences the Jews Solntsev–Bleichmann, Rothstein, etc. play the leading role. In the rest of the Bolshevik press, in scientific and fine literature, in the statistical and historical-political publications of the party, among the leading personalities of Soviet fine arts – everywhere the same picture: in the overwhelming majority Jewish names.

The Judaization of modern Russian culture begins in the schools. It is especially the higher educational institutions, the bearers of the country's intellectual life, where the Jews are most numerous represented.

In November 1929, in the most diverse technical schools of the RSFSR there were. 17 909 Jewish pupils and students. In detail:107)

In lower 1 172

in middle ■ 5 454

in higher 11 382

According to a census of September 15, 1929, the distribution of Jewish students among the individual subjects in the higher schools was as follows:108)

Industrial and technical – – 12.2 per cent.

Agricultural 12.7

Pedagogical 10.1 "

Medical 9.4 "

Economic 16.9 "

Arts 26,3 "

Ain strongest is the influx into the art schools, which are attended by over a quarter of all Jewish students. No wonder, then, if only Jewish art students are awarded prizes, and arts and sciences are entirely in Jewish hands.

The extent to which the Jewish element penetrates the educational system can also be seen from the following figures:109) of all students of higher educational institutions of the RSFSR, according to the same census: 75.3% were Russians, 10.6% Jews, 3.1% Ukrainians, 2.1% Belorussians. All other nationalities were less than 2%. Thus, Jews, whose share of the population in the RSFSR is about 20%, are represented in higher educational institutions more than their population ratio.

The Jews are trying to systematically eliminate the Russian spirit from the schools, starting already in the first level schools. Thus Larin110) already in 1924 demanded a reorganization of the Russian history lessons in the schools of the first level. According to this, the chapters about Oleg, Svyatoslav, Vladimir Monomakh, Ivan Kalita, etc., i.e. about the heroes and great men of the older Russian history should disappear from the textbook of Russian history:

"Let us imagine that not 2000 but 20 000 years have passed since the birth of Christ. It is impossible to teach then about Oleg, Ivan Kalita and about the church legislation of Tsar Alexei (there is even such a chapter in our textbook approved by the school administration)!"

It is true that under the People's Commissar Bubnov (Russian) Russian history can be taught again, but in his efforts to purge the Education Commissariat of Jewish senior officials originating from the Lunacharsky era, he met with impenetrable resistance. A weakening of Jewish influence in education would inevitably result in a change in the prevailing ideas and thus threaten the Jews' position of power most severely.

The present position of the Jews in the intellectual life of Russia is so important that Dmitrievsky rightly sees the deeper meaning of the little incident reproduced above in the fact that the new generation of Russia's educated will be predominantly Jewish. As far as it is not of Jewish blood, it will be educated in Jewish spirit in the educational institutions and in public life. Everything that is non-Jewish today will be relegated and suppressed. This is also true with regard to the ruling Bolshevik party and life conception: all party oppositions of the last years, which were carried by the Russian spirit, were defeated in the struggle against the official doctrine. The most prominent representatives of the latter, however, were the Jews.

If one also considers the enormous demand for intelligentsia in Soviet Russia – by the end of the 1st Five-Year Plan 1.5 million new specialists were needed – and their privileged position resulting from this more than in other countries, it is obvious what an outstanding position the Jews occupy as the determining representatives of the new intelligentsia in Russia.

As Dmitrievski points out, the Jewish power is planning to destroy everything Russian. And not only Russian in the narrower sense (i.e., Great Russians, Ukrainians and White Russians), but the same is happening with the Tatars, the Georgians (except the Georgian Jews), the Armenians, as the nations closest to the Russians in blood and culture. The following account gives a shattering account of the enormity of this process and the sufferings of the national Russian people: M1)

"In order to subjugate forever the conquered land, the ancient Assyrians carried away into captivity or destroyed the uppermost strata, the bearers of the national culture. Foreign-born elements were put in their place. The nation, thus deprived of its own leadership, lost its own face and fell into complete enslavement. The same methods are used by the subjugators of Russia today – only in more perfect and cruel forms and on a larger scale. If in the Old World thousands and tens of thousands were carried away, dispersed, destroyed, today millions of carriers of Russian blood and culture are driven away to the North. Everywhere in the Russian land the Russian people are driven away from the state government, from the cultural creative activity, from the education, from the simplest conditions of decent existence, and are turned into labor cattle, rotting in the darkness of a dirty barn. .**

... Who is at the head of the Soviet Union today? In the Politburo rules – the Jew Kaganovich. Stalin remains in a strange inactivity.112)

Foreign policy is entirely in Jewish hands. The People's Commissar is Litvinov (a Jew). Of his three deputies, Krestinsky is married to a Jewess and Sokolnikov (Brilliant) is a Jew. The third, Karakhan (Armenian), is now relegated to second place. Among the other foreign policy advisors to the Politburo, Lapinsky (Löwensohn) and again Radek, Jews, stand out.

The Soviet representations abroad: Dovgalevsky (Paris – Jew), Maiski (London – Jew), Petrovsky (Vienna – Jew), Yurenev (Tokyo – Jew), Karsky (Kovno – Jew), Kollontai (Stockholm – half-Jew), Stein (Helsingfors – Jew), Dartyan (Athens – Armenian). Only Potyomkin (Rome), Melnikov (Kabul), Alexan- drowski (Prague) and Antonov-Ovsejenko (Warsaw) are Russians. The latter two, however, are married to Jewish women. Also Jewish is the wife of Trojanowski (Washington).

The Soviet Russian representation at the World Economic Conference in London in May 1933 had a corresponding composition:

Chair: Litvinov (Jew);

Deputy: Meshlauk (Latvian);

Members: Maiski (Jew),
Ozerski (?).

The Gosplan, the leading authority for the elaboration of the five-year plans, is an almost purely Jewish domain under its Jewish chairman, Kuibyshev, deputy to the chairman of the Sovnarkom and a member of the Politburo.

The Foreign Trade Commissariat is completely dominated by Jews. People's Commissar is Rosenholtz (Jew); deputy: Eliawa (Jew ?) and Dwolaiski (Jew). The number of other senior members of the Commissariat is sufficiently indicated by the list of members of the Commissariat, heads of export trusts, trade representatives, etc., who were awarded the highest decorations on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Foreign Trade Monopoly. 113)

Rosenholtz (Jew), People's Commissar for Foreign Trade;

Weizer (Jew), trade representative in Berlin;

Boyev (non-Russian), deputy to the People's Commissar;

Ozerski (?), trade representative in London;

Dwolaiski (Jew), deputy to the People's Commissar;

Krajewski (Jew), head of timber export;

Skripko (Jew), plenipotentiary of the Commissariat for Western Siberia;

Kissin (Jew), head of grain export;

Kiselyov (Russian?), chairman of technical-industrial

Imports;

Levin (Jew), chairman of the Yushamtorg;

Kalmanevsky (Jew), head of industrial export;

Aleksandrov (?), deputy chairman of mining metal and machinery import;

Rabinovich (Jew), member of the College of Commissars;

Saltanov (Jew), Chairman of the Soviet Freight Transport;

Belenjki (Jew), head of the Soviet fur trade;

Kononov (?), worker;

Bron (Jew), member of the college;

Löwensohn (Jew), trade representative in Rome;

Ostrowski (?), Soviet naphtha export representative in Paris.

A total of 19, including 13 Jews (68.5 percent)!

Trade representatives abroad:

Weizer (Berlin - Jew),

Herstein (Tokyo - Jew), Löwensohn (Rome - Jew), Goldenberg (deputy, Paris - Jew), Friedstein (deputy, Riga - Jew).

People's Commissar for Heavy Industry is Ordzhonikidze (Georgian). Jews predominate in his environment. Deputy of the People's Commissar is Kaganovich's brother.

The deputy of the People's Commissar for Light Industry is German (Jew).

In the People's Commissariat for Woodworking Industry the leading role is played by Jew Fuschmann.

In the OGPU, the leading organ of domestic policy, Jagoda (Jew), deputy to the chairman of the OGPU, is actually the leading personality. Another deputy of the chairman - Agranov (Jew). The head of the main administration of the "labor and correction camps" of the OGPU. - Behrmann (Jew). His deputies - Fierin (?) and Rappaport (Jew).

At the head of the Political Administration of the Red Army is the Jew Schiffriess with his Jewish entourage. The People's Commissariats for Supply, Justice, Finance and the RKL, the STO. and the affiliated commissions are teeming with Jews. We have already discussed the individual appointments.

Agriculture, where Russian influence was previously strongest, is now entirely under Jewish control. The People's Commissar for Agriculture is Yakovlev (Epstein, a Jew). His main executive organs are the "Political Departments" in the sovkhozes and machine tractor stations (MTS.) scattered throughout the Union. The "Political Departments" are a creation of Kaganovich. Their establishment was prompted by the new agricultural policy of January 1933, which is characterized by "the desire to increase pressure on agriculture from the political side while maintaining economic principles." (114) The political departments were created on the model of the Red Army. Their heads are special confidants of the party, appointed directly by the CC. and are directly subordinate to the party leadership through the agricultural administrations.

"The head of the 'Political Departments' ... is a special Party control organ over the entire enterprise; he is given the position of deputy director and, as such, must also watch over the technical management of the enterprise, ... thus the

head of the enterprise is dependent in all his measures and functions on the approval of this control organ ... He must confine himself to carrying out the given directives and is controlled and directed in all his actions by the Political Director. ... " (115)

The "Political Departments" were brought together in the Agricultural Department, which was specially created within the Central Committee of the Party and in which the entire policy of the peasantry was concentrated. Kaganovich himself headed it.

The same politicization of operations in the transport sector, in order to squeeze greater labor output out of the tired and starving population by intensifying political pressure. A "Political Administration" of the railroads and local "Political Departments" were set up. The head of the Political Administration is the Jew Polonski. He is deputy to the People's Commissar and at the same time directly subordinate to the Central Committee of the Party, i.e. to Kaganovich and his entourage.

Thus, Politburo, Foreign and Domestic Policy, Foreign Trade, Supply, Agriculture and Industry, Finance, RKI. and the Political Administrations of the Red Army, Agriculture and Transport are wholly or largely under Jewish direction. One wonders involuntarily where Russians are then.

At the top of the administration some non-Jewish extras remain as figureheads. Mostly, however, these persons also have Jewish wives and are thus under Jewish influence. Russian names are especially numerous in the "representative" bodies, such as the Soviets and their executive committees and the like, but these bodies are themselves nothing but facades. Also characteristic of the present situation is the mobilization and consolidation of Jewish forces. Kaganovich has drawn all the Trotskyists over to him, and a union with Trotsky himself in the near future is more than likely.

As stated above, at the beginning of Stalin's epoch the ruling group in the party was very strongly anti-Semitic, and it seemed as if the Russian element wanted to make its final breakthrough. Today, the Stalin period is coming to an end, and the Kaganovich era is beginning. Jewish influence in the CPR, the stronghold of Jewry, is stronger than ever. The party unification (chistka) that has been going on since June of this year is directed against the anti-Semitic and national Russian element. In the Chistka commissions, which consist of only 3 to 5 members, Jewry is extremely strongly represented with 20-66%. (116)

The fact that the leading governmental and administrative apparatus is to a significant extent in Jewish, i.e. foreign, hands explains, as Dmitrievski rightly states, among other things, the monstrous Soviet economic methods and measures of state building:

"... These people are not sorry for the country and its people ... hence the ease with which the foreign-born rulers of Russia relate to the starvation and extinction of the Russian population."

Today's Bolshevik methods of socialist construction and the Jewish position of power in today's Russia were particularly blatantly demonstrated in the construction of the Baltic-White Sea Canal. The canal

was built by the GPU. The pace was very forced: in November 1931 the GPU. received the order and in June 1933, i.e. in one year and seven months, the works were finished. It was the first time that the dreaded GPU. was given supervision over the execution of a purely technical installation – another sign of the increasing use of the GPU.

The top management was in the hands of the deputy chairman of the GPU, the Jew Jagoda. The executors, engineers and workers, were convicts and inmates of the GPU concentration camps. In total, the top construction management consisted of the following, who were awarded the Order of Lenin after the completion of the canal:117)

Jagoda (Jew), deputy to the chairman of the GPU. top management;

Kogan (Jew), head of the Belomorstroi (Weifimeer canal construction);

Behrmann (Jew), head of the GPU's main administration of labor and correction camps...;

Fierin (?), head of the White Sea-Baltic camp of the GPU. and deputy of the above;

Rappaport (Jew), deputy head of Belomorstroi and deputy head of the GPU labor camps;

Shuk (Russian), deputy to the head of the GPU labor camps;

Fraenkel (Jew), assistant to the chief engineer and head of works;

Wershbitzki (?), deputy of the chief engineer.

The supreme management of the giant construction, on which 20,000 people worked at times, was in the hands of these 8 people. Of these, 5 were Jews, or 62.5%.

Among the 8 other heads of departments and leading engineers who were awarded the next lower order of the "Red Star", there are already only two Jews. One of them – Behrensohn – is the head of the entire financial management of the canal construction. Among the 15 other engineers, heads of working communes, etc., decorated with the next lower order, there is not a single Jew: just as in political life, the Jews are most strongly represented in the top management of the economic construction, and the key positions are occupied by them.

The construction of the canal through a wild impassable nature demanded extraordinary achievements from engineers and workers. Swamps, rocks, huge forests characterize the area.

In total, 118 hydraulic structures (dams, sluices, weirs, etc.) were built and almost 10 million m³ of excavations were made, including 2.5 million m³ in rocky soil. A total of 21 million m³ of soil was moved.

People were not spared. In order to save costs (foreign loans were not approved), the use of machines was refused. Everything was done by hand. The head of canal construction, K o g a n, relates:118)

". . . We asked the engineers: 'well, are we going to complete the canal by the deadline?' Or, maybe even before the deadline?4

The engineers are dismayed: the project includes 20 million m³ of earthworks, 2 million m³ of which are in rock. Hundreds of thousands of m³ of concrete. Dozens of hydraulic engineering installations, millions of m³ of woodwork. The deadline is short, the project is not finished. Karelia is the land of swamps and rocks.

They are dismayed and answer: 'If there are 150 excavators, 80 locomotives, a few dozen compressors, we will finally be able to build.4

We reject such "astronomy" outright. We tell the engineers the truth: "You need not hope for that. He who sets as an indispensable condition the use of dredges and locomotives does not want to build the canal. If we get some of these beautiful things, we will increase the speed. But now reckon on the shovel, the wheelbarrow, the digging and the hand boring . . ."

Litvinov (gelding)

That is: with human muscles, sinews, human blood, as hundreds and thousands of years ago.



As we stated above, today in Soviet Russia there is an extraordinarily strong anti-Semitism in all strata of the population. Its source is the dominant position of the Jews in the leadership of the country and the repression of the natives. In addition, after the revolution and especially since the struggle against the Trotsky opposition, the national antagonism has become more and more predominant. If the Jewish question, which in old Russia was also a social question, was "solved" by the Jewish Bolsheviks, today, aggravated by the regroupment and the penetration of Jews into all professions, the Jewish question has become a völkisch-national one.

In general, since the Revolution, the peoples of the Union have undergone a period of growth in their national feeling. This development, which was to be foreseen after the Bolshevik policy of nationality, has produced a number of forces which were bound to come into natural opposition to the international communist ideas. These new counterforces, as far as they are spread in Russianness, are not guided by abstract ideas, but by primal racial instincts and by a völkisch-national will. Representatives of this direction, members of the younger generation, are already in the leading state and party apparatus. These men, who may one day guide the destiny of the country, come from a different environment and from different experiences than the founders of the Soviet state. They feel that the revolution has only just begun, a Russian revolution against Jewry: they have realized that only what serves the people is viable.

Thus, the Komsomol members ask questions about the meaning and possibilities of the five-year plans, about the tasks of the Red Army and the like. They speak of the army with reverence and love and hope for a liberator from among them. Russian communist youth is beginning to remember the dominant position of the Great Russians before the war. It is filled with national pride in the Russians who created the Reich, it rightly points to the Union of the SSR, and it is proud of the Wehrmacht and the military youth organizations which, according to the will of this youth, should no longer be the instrument of world revolution but the defensive weapon of the Russian soil. The Komsomol, mind you, not the Jewish top and apparatus, but the mass of young communists, wants a socialism of the Russian nation in place of Jewish rule over the Russian people.

The mood of the Komsomol, which at present numbers about 5 million – that is about % of the total working-class youth – reflects the thought processes of the Russian youth. The youth is looking for new ways, it does not yet express itself clearly, but it makes practical criticisms of the Five-Year Plan and looks for means to eliminate the extreme misery of millions of Russian nationals. It compares the Russian economy to a huge factory with low and, for the most part, inferior output. The nationalism of the Russian youth is fostered by the fact that precisely because of the restriction of socialist construction to Russia, contrary to the intentions of the ruling clique, the Russian national is becoming more and more Russian, more and more distant from abroad, from the outside.

The opposition in the Communist Party in 1950, 1952 and 1955 is formed under the leadership of Russians – Syrtsov, Ryutin, A. Smirnov, etc. It is formed in the Moscow Soviet, in the heart of the RSFSR, in the heart of the Soviet state. The people began to distinguish the concept of nation from that of citizenship. The concept of the blood and racial diversity of the peoples of the Union begins to gain ground. The general interest in racial issues is on the rise. The National Socialist revolution in Germany, since the borders cannot be hermetically sealed, has made a tremendous impression on the Russian people.

Just as the Russian national and imperial feeling has grown in the Russian people, the nationalism of the other peoples has increased to a considerable extent, albeit under centrifugal signs. Both forces, "Great Russian chauvinism," as the official party expression goes, and "local nationalism," exist not only by the Bolshevik leaders' own admission, but they are constantly growing. About these forces Stalin stated in

his political account at the 16th Party Congress in July 1950:119)

"They are present and, what is the main thing, they are growing. There can be no doubt about that. It is clear that the general atmosphere of aggravation of the class struggle must lead to a certain aggravation of national frictions, which are also reflected in the Party."

Opposed to this generally increasing nationalism in Soviet Russia, as an international ferment, as the most outstanding representative of doctrine and dictatorship, is Jewry. Jewish colonization had resulted in a certain revival of Jewish nationalist currents, but just as in Western Europe, since the emancipation of the Jews, national Jewish life has disintegrated and the external assimilation of the Jews to their host peoples has begun, so in Russia, since the Revolution, a strong process of assimilation has begun.

Understandably, it is strongest among the Jewish party members. Thus, according to the party census of January 10, 1927, of a total of 45,911 Jewish Communists, only 36.6 per cent said that they were Jewish, but 61.8 per cent said that they spoke Russian.^m) Thus, if within Jewry there are opposing currents - national and assimilationist - in questions of the development of national culture, the common real goal of Jewry is the consolidation of Bolshevik power and the preservation of the Jewish element predominating in it.

The Russian national youth, which wants to have its own Russian revolution, is opposed by Jewry and its adherents, who have to defend an international and non-people's position of power. The national movement, which feels more and more connected to the infinite Russian earth and draws strength and tasks from it, is opposed as the outermost opponents by the Jews who are foreign to the country. A victory of the national idea would mean the end of the Jewish position of power, a rule which in fact serves only the interests of a minority, the ruling administrators of a system built on alienation from life and people.

At present, however, Jewry is at the height of its power. And since it has the possibility of exercising rule for the first time and on a scale perhaps unprecedented, its urge to exploit this possibility and to preserve it for itself permanently is tremendous. The Jews are the most ardent defenders of the Marxist-Bolshevik doctrine. Any deviation from the letter of Lenin's law, no matter how much it is caused by the extreme need of the people, means violation of the party doctrine and is punished as a counter-revolutionary act by banishment or shooting. The history of recent party oppositions has shown this time and again.

Put it all together: Instinct for power, tremendous opportunity for the satisfaction of this instinct, strongest support from world Jewry, extreme unscrupulousness of methods and a certain passivity of the Russian have made possible the dominant position of the Jews in the life of Soviet Russia to this day. In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics 165 million are dominated by about 2.9 million Jews and their followers:

"Foreign domination has never been so powerful as now," writes Dmitrievsky, "never has the Russian governing element been so dull and powerless as now. The present party unification is intended to make Kaganovich the fully valid autocrat, the Kagan¹²¹) over Russia." ¹²²⁾

Anti-Semitism rises against this position of power of the Jews. The growing nationalism in Russia is rising against the Jewish leadership grouped around Kaganovich. Hostility towards the Jews has already found its way into the Red Army and into leading party and government circles. The party opposition, always led by Russians since 1930, is supported by the national-Russian elements in the Komsomol, in contrast to its Jewish leadership. Even if not all the demands of the youth are clearly formulated, and they do not yet know the path that leads to national liberation, they do have one clear demand: Russia for the Russians.

Russia today, as so often in earlier centuries, is under foreign domination. It is a tragic peculiarity of Russian history that the government and the governed were so often not of one people. Normans,

Khosars, Tatars, Poles, Lithuanians and others have ruled, in some cases for centuries. Today, after the border barrier of the settlement zone has been swept away by the revolution, it is the Jews.

After the tremendous shocks of the war and the two revolutions, after the heroic period of the civil wars, the struggles against Trotskyism and the work on "socialism in in which, in contrast to the ruling clique, it put a purely national sense, today the Russian people in all its strata is experiencing a period of powerful upsurge of its national feeling. With each passing day the national currents are growing, the elementary, but at first still impotent drive of the Russian people to its liberation is growing.

Thus, today the Russian people again face the historic task of liberating their country from the foreign domination exercised by Judo-Marxism against the Russian people. The national struggle for freedom of the Russian people is at the same time a struggle against the mortal enemy of all nations - the Communist International, in whose guise the nation-destroying Marxism and international Jewry have formed an alliance against the peace and freedom of the world.

"the absence of an anti-Jewish film will probably have its reason in the composition of the Soviet cinema and the film section of the Association of Fighting Godless".